



From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

500
2500

W. Henry Green

Philadelphia

Feb 1st 1857

...and ...
...

...

THE
FIRST RESURRECTION
CONSIDERED

IN A

Series of Letters:

OCCASIONED BY A TREATISE OF THE LATE
REV. H. GIPPS, LL.B.

BY
JOSEPH D'ARCY SIRR, A.M. M.R.I.A.
RECTOR OF KILCOLEMAN.

P H I L A D E L P H I A :

ORRIN ROGERS, 67 SOUTH SECOND STREET.

E. G. Dorsey, Printer.

1841.



ADVERTISEMENT.

The following pages were penned at the request of the Rev. James Anderson, Rector of Moore and Drum, in the Diocese of Tuam, who put Mr. Gipps' book, unexpectedly, into the hands of the author.—As the examination was undertaken, in obedience to the wishes of a private friend, and commenced without any view to publication, the work itself is not shaped as it would have been, under other circumstances. Much of the practical bearing of the subject has been omitted—the reader is requested to make up the deficiency, by bringing every page at once to the test of God's revealed word, and to the throne of grace. The matters discussed, are of infinite moment; affect in the deepest manner our respective relations to time and eternity; and can only subserve any salutary end when our inquiries into them are conducted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and in reverent submission to his authority.—Oh! that there were one unanimous cry to arise, from every section of the visible Church, for the outpouring of the Spirit on the whole.—Till this event arrive, we shall be torn with dissensions—led astray by every error that arises—and polluted with evils.—It becomes us now with an irrepressible energy, with entreaties that admit of no denial, to cry mightily to the Lord to restore his comforts unto us, and revisit his vine—for—**THE LORD IS NIGH, EVEN AT THE DOORS**, to take account of his servants.

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

Author's respect for Mr. Gipps.—The Second Advent not more discoursed of in the New Testament than in the Old.—Difference of opinion on the subject does not depend on the Interpretation of Rev. xx. 4, 5.—The Second Coming of Christ is foretold in the previous part of the book.—Danger of Interpreting words, not according to the context, but according to their use in other places, when applied to other subjects.—Ten points.—Eight considerations examined.—Argument from authority rebutted, - - - - - 5—35

LETTER II.

PARABLES.—Wheat and Tares.—Criticism on the expression *Kingdom of Heaven*, illustrated by *grain of mustard seed*.—Confounding the judgment on the wicked quick, and on the wicked dead, cause of error.—Harvest and Vintage, Joel ii. 3, 11.—The Draw Net.—The Marriage Supper.—Talents.—Judgment, illustrated by reference to Dan. vii. 13.—The words *Nations*.—*Saints* explained.—*Goats* and *Sheep*, Ezek. xxxiv. 10, 31. Mic. iv. 6, 8, - - - - - 36—57

LETTER III.

The TRANSFIGURATION.—The Coming-One.—2 Pet. i. 16.—Prophecy of the Judgment, Matt. xxiv.—Parable of the Fig-tree and all the trees, Luke xxi.—The Gospel Kingdom.—Figurative Comings.—The Last Day.—Christ's voice heard in the grave.—The Judgment-seat of Christ.—Retribution of enemies, - - - - - 58—84

LETTER IV.

THE KINGDOM.—Matt. xiii. 41; xvi. 28.—Luke i. 33; xxii. 30.—John xviii. 36.—Eph. v. 5.—Col. i. 13.—2 Tim. iv. 18.—Heb. i. 8.—2 Pet. i. 11, THE DELIVERING UP OF THE KINGDOM.—1 Cor.

THE
FIRST RESURRECTION.

LETTER I.

Author's respect for Mr. Gipps.—The Second Advent not more discoursed of in the New Testament than in the Old.—Difference of opinion on the subject does not depend on the Interpretation of Rev. xx. 4, 5.—The Second Coming of Christ is foretold in the previous part of the book.—Danger of Interpreting words, not according to the context, but according to their use in other places, when applied to other subjects.—Ten points.—Eight considerations examined.—Argument from authority rebutted.

11th May, 1833.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I have complied with your request, and perused Mr. Gipps' treatise on the First Resurrection with the most diligent attention. The excellent spirit, which pervades it, is just what I should have expected from a man of the deep piety, which I believe the author to have possessed. I remember still, with great pleasure, the sweet savour of his preaching on one occasion at St. John's, Chichester, some years ago, where I had the privilege of hearing him. His mode of treating the subject also, is what it ought have been, an appeal to the written word. In obedience to your request, I will just glance at the principal topics, with as much regard to your desire for brevity as possible, and with all the respect, which is due to the memory of so devoted a minister of the word.

I. The notion with which he set out, of finding *a priori* more of the Second Advent in the New Testament than in the Old, is one which cannot be granted and is quite unfounded. One, who comes to the perusal of any part of the Bible with a preconceived conviction of what he must, or must not find there, is sure to err. In point of fact, the New Testament contains vastly more of the *first* Advent, than we meet with about it in the Old. It is actually a history of all that related to that advent, with lengthened proofs that he who has come is the Mes-

siah, though he has not yet fulfilled all that was predicted concerning him; and hortatory declarations of duty, involved in, and arising out of the fact, that the Virgin-born deliverer has appeared. These declarations necessarily connect themselves with the completion of the deliverance, to be effected at the period of the second advent, respecting which, therefore, we meet with abundant intimations for the encouragement of the faithful. But these notices of the coming one, (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) are, in general, assumptions rather than descriptions of the fact, that he will return as the destined conqueror and king. They suppose the previously revealed matter as certain; and rather enforce the moral obligations connected with his Epiphany to come, than detail its results. These, on the contrary, are to be met with, at great length, in the Prophets, and therefore are we directed to them for illumination in all that relates to the Presence (παρουσία) and Majesty (μεγαλειότης) of Jesus. 2 Pet. i. 16.

2. The assertion, that “all the difference of opinion upon the subject *originates* from the interpretation of a passage in the New Testament,” viz. Rev. xx. 4, 5, is a decided mistake. Blot that passage out of the Book of Revelation, and still the reign of Jesus with the saints will stand forth as a revealed truth, both in that book from which it is thus blotted out, and in almost every book of the Bible, either in the way of type, or of prediction, or of exhortation. Yet is it on the assumption of this error, that the whole work is penned. Had it indeed been stated, that from this passage alone we obtain any information of the length of time that Satan is to be bound; and that it is from the *thousand years*, to which his bondage is here limited, the name of Millenarians came to be attached to those, who believe in the personal reign of Christ and his saints, his observation had been correct. The thousand years are not the limit of their reign, though they are the limit of Satan’s captivity. Nor is it from this place we derive the proof, that the “Lord my God shall come, and all his saints with him,” to reign on earth reclaimed to his authority, rescued from the usurper’s grasp, and made new. But having from sundry passages of the lively oracles, that have been committed to us, learned that such is the divine purpose, we affirm that this particular prediction must refer to the time, when they, who are the children of the resurrection, shall accompany the Messiah on his return, as joint heirs with him, to claim the Heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, as the rightful Heir of the world, as Abraham’s seed, as Jesse’s root, and as David’s son and successor on Israel’s throne, in whom and to whom, the kingdom

is established for the ages. *He that overcometh* shall have power over the nations, and rule them with a rod of iron, shivering them to pieces, as a potter's vessel, Rev. ii. 26, 27; shall sit with Christ on his own throne, Rev. iii. 21; and shall inherit all things. Rev. xxi. 7. The burden of the ransomed song is, *we shall reign on the earth*, and when therefore on the ejection of Satan, John beholds thrones occupied, and the sitters thereon united with the martyrs, who are represented as reigning concurrently with them; and when we find him further affirming concerning this event, which in symbolic show passes before his view, *this is the first resurrection*, we cannot entertain a doubt, that he saw in prospect that glorious consummation, for which the disembodied just express such devout and confident desire.

3. The assertion, that "the Second coming of Christ has not been described, as he conceived, in the previous part of the book" of Revelation, is an error the very reverse of that on which I first remarked. What! is the second coming of Christ not noticed up to the very close of a book, which is entitled **THE REVELATION** of Jesus Christ, ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ? Not noticed chap. i. 7.—*Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also, which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him; even so, Amen?* Not noticed in the Epistles to the Seven Churches, throughout which the warning *else I will come unto thee quickly*, is so oft repeated, in connexion with the reward to be bestowed on the conquerors, and the rule over the nations, and the impress of the New Jerusalem name, and the admission to the supper, and the elevation to the throne? Not noticed under the Sixth Seal, where, with despairing agony, the apostate confederates roar out their deep distress to the mountains and the rocks to shelter them *from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb*;—chap. vi. 12, 17? Not noticed, where the two sealed companies of Israel and of the nations, washed in white robes, are described in the act of following the Lamb, who dwelleth in the midst of them, feedeth them, leadeth them to living fountains of waters, and wipeth away all their tears;—chap. vii. 14, 17? Not noticed, *when the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying,—the worldly kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ is come,* and he shall reign for the ages of the ages*; when the elders praise Almighty God, saying—*thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned*. Rev. xi. 15, 19? Not noticed, when a loud voice announced the fact in heaven, *now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God*

* So Griesbach correctly reads the text.

day and night. Rev. xii. 10? Not noticed; when the Son of Man is actually described as crowned and seated on a white cloud, reaping the harvest and treading the vintage of the earth. Rev. xiv. 14, 20? Not noticed, when the thundered Hallel is uttered—*Allelujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,—Let us be glad and rejoice and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready*, when he goeth forth on the white horse, followed by the armies of heaven, to smite the nations, rule them with the rod of iron and tread the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. Rev. xix. 1, 21? If so, then is the coming of Christ not noticed in any part of the book, nor is the resurrection. Not a word of either is mentioned. Rev. xx. 11. The whole book is either introductory to, or descriptive of his Apocalypse. The fallacy, however, has been attempted to be justified by an argument which applies particularly to the last passage I have referred to. It is thus put:—The description in ch. xix. 11, 21, cannot, I conceive, be understood of Christ's second coming in person, because he is there described as "riding upon a white horse, clothed in a vesture dipped in blood; having a sword going out of his mouth; and having a name written upon his thigh!" Now nothing of this kind was the case when he ascended; and consequently nothing of the kind will be the case when he comes in person a second time, for it is expressly declared, Acts i. 11: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven." It might, perhaps, be sufficient to say that the silence of the divine historians concerning the minute accompaniments of the ascension, affords no warrant for the hasty assertion, that nothing of the kind took place then. The record of the fact does not *negative* the occurrence of such circumstances at that juncture. We may presume what we please, but we have no right to argue from thence as if our presumption was a certainty. I take it to be highly probable that the conjecture is correct, and that Christ was not then mounted on a white horse, had no name written on his thigh, no raiment stained in blood wrapped around him, and no sword proceeding out of his mouth, but what does this prove? Nothing. Equally dissimilar with this negative description of his ascent, is the asserted, but unproved, description of his coming. Rev. xx. 11, 12. When he ascended, sat he upon a white throne, stood there before him the dead, small and great, and were there opened before him then the books of life and of death? The *manner* (ὁ τρόπος,) by which he went and by which he shall return, relates not to the mere adventitious or collateral cir-

cumstances, which attended his departure, or which shall mark his return; but denotes either the literal path by which he traversed the heaven, (*σύννεφος*), the clouds by which he was obscured and from which he shall emerge; or the speed, unexpectedness, *glory*, and superiority to the laws of matter, which distinguished his ascent. But the argument he made use of, p. 98, overturns the reasoning of Mr. Gipps, in this place entirely. The omission in some prophecies of an incident, (such as that noticed Zech. ix. 9.) connected with some future event, which is, nevertheless, foretold in some other prophecy, regarding the same event, by no means justifies the idea, that such predictions do not relate to one and the same event, or that such incidents shall not mark its occurrence. The prediction in Acts i. 11, makes no mention of the myriads of his holy ones, by whom he shall be attended, when he returns; yet by those myriads shall he be surrounded. Two angels stood by the side of his disconsolate disciples, after his departure from them; but not one is said to have visibly hovered about his person, as his ascent was effected. He shall be accompanied by them on his return, all joyous as the ministering attendants on his glory; but when he ascended he left them behind him sorrowing. But let men argue as they may, the description in Rev. xix. of the WORD OF GOD may be shewn, by many undeniable proofs, to be indeed the literal description of him at his *second advent*. First, that description is introduced as already noticed by the deafening acclamations of the countless multitude, who make the heaven ring because the Omnipotent reigneth. Secondly, their joy knows no bounds because the marriage of the Lamb is come. Can there be a doubt that *that* marriage will be solemnized, I appeal to Mr. Gipps' own statement, (see p. 32,) at the second advent of Messiah. Is not the Bride represented, as having made herself ready? But it is also in this aspect she is presented before us, as adorned for her husband, under the symbol of the New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, (Rev. xxi. 2,) which relates, according to Mr. Gipps, to the heavenly state. Thirdly, as the going forth of Messiah is to smite the nations and trample them in fury, so it issues in the supper of slaughtered carcasses provided for the fowls of heaven, and the consignment of the beast, (*θηρίον*) and the false prophet, and their respective votaries to the lake of fire. If there be any one thing, plainly revealed, it is this, that the Man of Sin will be destroyed by the brightness of the Redeemer's coming; and I believe there can be none found to assert that any of the ungodly, or still more, that all the living worshipers of the beast, with the beast himself and his confederate prophet, the antitypical Balak and Balaam, shall be cast into

the lake of fire, before the second coming of Jesus. I cannot but express my regret, that such a man as Mr. Gipps should have allowed himself to sanction the evil practice of many, who stand in no awe of God's word, by speaking of the *absurdity*, which this view involves. It is a mode of reasoning to which we should never have recourse, where the word of God is concerned. What our purblind reason may deem *absurd* enough, divine Wisdom may regard in all the clearness of assured fact, or positive demonstration. Were it a legitimate method of argument, the Jews might, with effect, have reasoned on the absurdity of a Virgin producing a son, or of the king Messiah riding on an ass and its colt. But while he reasoned on the absurdity of "any worm of the earth, any sinful child of man," being able to make war against Christ in person, and therefore judged the whole prophecy to be figurative, he overlooked the fact that no such power was claimed by, no such design attributed to these congregated battalions of ungodly men. Rev. xix. 19, is not expressive of the purpose entertained by the antagonists of Jesus, but of the fact that John saw them in vision *gathered together* (*πρὸς αὐτὸν συνηχθῆναι*) to make battle against the warrior horseman—(*πρὸς αὐτὸν* may be taken either transitively or intransitively). Now if we look back to Rev. xvi. 14, we shall find that they are actually gathered together to this battle by the seducing agency of demons, unclean and frog-like spirits, even as was Ahab led up, by a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets, to that fatal field where closed alike his ignominious life and reign. To oppose their might to that of the Omnipotent they could entertain no idea; of the result they could have no conception.—The issue is hidden from their eyes. They are led up ignorantly to Armageddon, without the most distant conception of the collision, which must ensue. They go not forth intentionally against the Messiah; they set him at nought and discredit his very being, for they are the worshippers of the Anti-Messiah, who is their leader. The absence of any such intention on their part is quite clear from the statement, that they were acting under delusion: "the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he DECEIVED them that had the mark of the beast." Rev. xix. 20. Again the Devil is imprisoned "that he should DECEIVE the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled," Rev. xx. 3. But being thus assembled, Messiah straight proceeds against *them* to battle, followed by the armies of heaven, to assert his own title to worship and to empire, and bestows their carcasses on the birds of prey, while he casts the beast and the false prophet alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. Compare the statement itself with

other prophecies, and you will find, that what the deluded confederates meditate is to make war against Israel. Dan. xi. 44, *utterly to make away many*, or rather, *to devote many to destruction under the pretext of religion*. But Michael unexpectedly stands up for the children of his people, Dan. xii. 1. Compare particularly Zech. xiv. 1, 5. In verse 2 of this last passage, and in Rev. xvi. 16, the gathering of the nations, which is indeed effected in his providence, is attributed to Jehovah. It is against Jerusalem they direct the efforts of their hostility, and while engaged in war against the people of God, *the Lord my God and all his saints come* to their utter discomfiture. He, who touches Israel touches the apple of his eye; and thus, therefore, in one sense do they make actual war against him. The issue is similarly described Isa. lxvi. 15, 24. The whole absurdity was in Mr. Gipps' own mind from not comparing the predictions, which relate to this crisis, and from not understanding the sense accordingly, in which they made war against the Word of God and his army.

4. Suffer me to point out the danger of the following mode of reasoning. "The *ideas*, which occur in ver. 4, such as "I saw the souls of them which were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus—living—reigning—with Christ—priests—dead;" occur also, as I shall endeavour hereafter to shew in other passages of Scripture, in reference to the saints in this life, he cannot therefore conclude from the mere use of these expressions, that the resurrection here spoken of must *necessarily* be that of the saints in their glorified bodies; and that their living and reigning with Christ must *necessarily* be the living and reigning of the saints in glory, with Christ personally present with them." Words, which in themselves are applicable to a vast variety of objects, can never necessarily be confined in their import to any one of those objects, which they variously represent. Even proper names cannot thus be restricted. Pronounce or write the name *John*, and it will not in itself, necessarily denote any one individual. It may denote the *Baptist* or *John of Gaunt*, or the king of England so named. Even *Jesus* may signify the son of Nun, or the son of Sirach, or the son of Mary. The sense of a whole passage is that, which can alone determine the object, which any word is designed to bring before our mind. This indeed is afterwards admitted, but still a long note is appended to prove that the word (*αναστασις*) *resurrection* is used to signify a moral change, in Luke ii. 34.—and "*all* the resurrection, which Christ imparts to his people," both that of the soul here, and of the body hereafter, in John xi. 25, as if some mighty mystery were contained in the possible application of the word *resurrection*, to something wholly differ-

ent from the re-embodiment of a departed spirit. As well might some thorough-going Sceptic employ scripture to defend his infidelity, and caution us against the doctrine of the resurrection, as he might just as conclusively do by calling on us to remark that the verb (*ανιστημι*) to rise again, from which the substantive (*αναστασις*) *resurrection*, takes its origin, is employed to denote the act of standing up from a posture of repose, and does not *necessarily* imply the notion of resurrection, as understood by the orthodox. He might appeal too, in confirmation of his opinion, to such scriptures as the following;—"he said unto him, follow me, and he, (Levi,) arose and followed him," Mark ii. 14. None believed that this Publican was raised from the dead. "If Satan rise up against himself and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end," Mark iii. 26. Who believes that Satan actually was once embodied, and is capable of resuming flesh, dividing himself in twain, and dooming his whole person to annihilation? "And there arose certain and bare false witness against him," Mark xiv. 57. It never was understood that false witnesses arose from the dead, to testify against the blessed Redeemer; nor yet, that the High Priest before whom he was arraigned, was a dead man, who suddenly became instinct with life. When he *stood up*, (*αναστας*) ver. 60, and examined Jesus concerning the things whereof he was accused. "The young men arose, bound him (Ananias) up, and carried him out, and buried him," Acts v. 6. Was it ever supposed that a miracle was performed on a number of dead youths, that they might remove the corpse of this transgressor to the grave? Similar questions might be put concerning the rising up of the sect of the Sadducees in a state of indignation, Acts v. 17, and of the sect of the Libertines, Acts vi. 9. &c., but there is enough of this idle exposure of criticism. Let this system of hesitation concerning the possible meaning of words be pursued, and there will be nothing certain in Scripture.—Nay, let it be brought to bear on all we read and hear, and we shall be reduced to universal scepticism. The obvious and grammatical import of plain words must ever be taken, or we must fall into endless error. It is of all things essential, that by this rule we shall abide, in the perusal of what God has written. He never employed *equivokes* to express his mind to his creatures. Now it so happens that as it regards Rev. xx. 4., we are given an antecedent intimation, that leaves no room for reasonable doubt as concerns its real meaning. The kings of the earth being gathered together by the agency of the frog-like Demons, and by the divine appointment, to Armageddon, "the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of Heaven,

saying, IT IS DONE," Rev. xvi. 17. This surely expresses the completion of all predicted and purposed vengeance on the apostate nations, the grand and fearful winding up of the present dispensation. Nor can this be an erring exposition, for it is also written, "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Rev. x. 7. But the vengeance which befalls the infidel faction with their kings, their captives and their mighty men, at Armageddon; the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, so long pent up in the seventh vial, is all discharged by the Warrior Horseman; whose regal dignity is inscribed on his vesture and his thigh, as detailed in the close of chap. xix. immediately before the notice of the first Resurrection; and the confederates are either cast alive into the lake of fire, or furnish food to the fowls of Heaven. Now these confederates, thus removed from the land of the living, are pre-eminently the dead in sin. They were all the worshippers of the Beast, and included amongst them all those throughout Christendom, "who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii. 12. If they, therefore, who at this era fall under judgment as the dead in sin, are thus weeded out of the earth, it necessarily follows that it cannot be of such as in this sense only are *dead*, that the remark is made, in contrast with the occupants of the thrones, who live and reign with Christ the thousand years, and constitute the first resurrection, "but the rest of the dead lived not again, till the thousand years were finished;"—whence it follows, that the rest of the dead are no other than the disembodied, who rejected the testimony of God against themselves. I am aware of Mr. Gipp's singular opinion, that the living and reigning with Christ a thousand years, is a figure, for the spiritual opposition to the still rampant Beast, of a succession of persons, none of whom he will permit to come to a natural end, but all of whom he is to cut off with the sword of martyrdom, as fast as they arise, their ranks being filled up by others, who are similarly to be slain for their resistance to his worship and his mark. The millennium is thus to be a season, not of peace, but of blood—not of rest, but of trouble—not of life, but of death! *Credat qui vult!*—Strange indeed, would it be, if so direful a spirit were to spring up, and the most terrific and enduring of all persecutions, with which the Church was ever to be visited, should commence just as Satan was bound! Strange that his work should be so much better done for him, when wholly removed from the scene, than when personally acting with all his evil energy, in all the children of disobedience, throughout the region of his usurped do-

minion! I know not how to account for it, that an idea such as this could ever have obtained admission into such a mind. The Beast is but Satan's puppet—the Dragon gives him his own throne, authority, and power, Rev. xiii. 2. The whole world worships the Dragon, for his liberality to the Beast, ver. 4. The Dragon is the grand conspirator in leading up the kings of the earth to Armageddon. (Rev. xvi. 13.) under the guidance of the Beast, whose head is at this time, identified with the Man of Sin, "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," 2 Thess. ii. 9. The gathering together therefore, at Armageddon, the rule of the Beast, his evil doings, and his disastrous end must, beyond all question, take place before the imprisonment of Satan, and the expiry of his deceitful working. But the thrones are only then occupied, and the martyrs only then reign, when the binding of Satan takes place. It is during the thousand years of his captivity that they are expressly said to reign, in the passage before us, and it thence follows indisputably, that their reign is subsequent to the downfall and judgment of the Beast, and that their rejection of, and martyrdom by him, were anterior to that event. This is altogether so obvious, that I never supposed that it could have been doubted.

6. The whole of chap. xx. and part of xxi. having been quoted at length, ten points are deduced from the perusal of this important portion of holy Scripture. Some are self-evident; others are enlarged on afterwards. They demand but little observation. In his *seventh* point we are met with the assertion, that death and the grave, as the enemies of Christ, are not destroyed at the *first resurrection* but at the judgment before the white throne. None maintain, that they are so destroyed at the first resurrection; it remains to be proved, that they will be so at the latter. Nothing can be more obvious, than that Death and Hades being cast into the lake of fire denotes simply, that the ungodly dead are consigned to that dread furnace, whose bodies were previously preyed on by the one, and whose souls had once populated the other. Thus viewed, they must be regarded as the prison-keepers of the ungodly, rather than as the enemies of Christ. In this latter respect they are not brought before us here. It is material to notice that a previous judgment, executed on the beast and the false prophet, a thousand years preceding, had consigned them to the same place of torment, chap. xix. 20. The mere casting of the wicked into that abyss, therefore, is not tantamount to the destruction of death and Hades as the enemies of Christ. I will not enter here on the whole argument, but I think it necessary to premise, with reference to future reasonings, that the time,

when the old heavens and the old earth pass away, are by no means marked in Rev. xx. 11. It is there simply stated, that he who sitteth upon the great white throne is one, from whose face they *did* flee away. The period of their flight, and the character of their flight, an expression by the way, as figurative as any that occurs in the book, are left altogether undetermined. Yet do we meet with a remarkable note, in the previous part of the book, which leads us at once to determine the juncture, when the figurative flight occurs. Under the *sixth* seal, which plainly marks the judgment on the nations at Armageddon, it is written, "the heaven departed as a scroll, when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. Rev. vi. 14.

7. The ten points having been made, are followed by *eight considerations*. I proceed to notice them *seriatim*. The *first consideration* is thus expressed:—"The description, which the Holy Ghost has given of the *persons*, who will reign with Christ, as signified in this passage, convinces me that he does not intend to signify the saints reigning with Christ after his second coming. If he had intended this, I feel assured he would have given such a designation of those who reign, as would apply to *all* the saints without exception." I am prepared to prove, that the language here employed does include them all, but I feel constrained *in limine* to protest against this mode of putting the question. The matter at issue is simply this, has the Spirit spoken *universally* of the saints as thus reigning, or has he confined his description to a particular class of saints, to the exclusion of the residue. It is not for us to argue what would have been, or what ought to have been the mode of expression employed by the Holy Spirit, under particular circumstances. It is not by our estimate of the proprieties of expression, that we are to judge of the diction employed by the Holy Spirit; neither must we presume to do so. But he proceeds—"Verse 6, limits the reigning to those, who partake of the *first resurrection*. This, therefore, excludes all the saints who remain *alive* at the time of the second coming of Christ, because they will not partake of any *resurrection* as they have not died." Now, verse 6 does not limit the reigning to those who partake of the first resurrection, but simply pronounces those blessed, who have a part in it. Taking it thus for granted, that the living saints are excluded from the description of the first resurrection, (Rev. xx. 6,) another step in advance is made, and 1 Cor. xv. 50, 54, and 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17, are appealed to, to prove that the living saints, as well as those who have died, shall rejoice together at the second advent; and it is thence concluded, from the discovery of so essential a difference, that the events

referred to, in Rev. xx. 4, 6, on the one hand, and in 1 Cor. xv. 50, 54, and in 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17, on the other, are widely dissimilar. According to this mode of reasoning, his own system would equally fall to the ground. He maintained, that the just and the unjust will arise together, or so nearly together, that they will both stand, at the same time, on the same day, before the bar of judgment. But the unjust are not named in 1 Cor. xv. nor by implication included in 1 Thess. iv. Those passages, therefore, cannot refer to the resurrection of the dead, as they contain so incomplete a representation of the prodigies of the last day, as necessarily to constitute, by the vast amount of omission, an essential difference between the two events. In looking over the Roman History, I often find it stated that the Romans conquered; without noticing the auxiliaries from various nations under heaven, which composed their army; and in the same manner the various fortunes of Napoleon Bonaparte are continually referred to, without any references being made to the tributary forces, by whose aid he pushed on his victories; or notwithstanding whose assistance he sustained defeat; are we therefore to conclude, that the armies either of the one or of the other were composed exclusively either of Romans or of Frenchman? With as much evidence of truth might we conclude, that martyrs only are included in the narrative of the first resurrection. I know that such a conclusion indeed has been drawn by my Millenarian friend, Mr. Burgh, from the place before us, since he restricts the sense of this passage to those, who have at least had the spirit of martyrs. Now I, for my part, believe that all the Lord's real children possess just such a spirit, for they have the spirit of Jesus. No other spirit but the spirit of Jesus is the spirit of martyrdom. He justifies his conclusion, however, by identifying the white robed armies of Rev. xix. 14, with the sitters upon thrones. He supposes them to be the understood nominative to the verb *sat*; and because the white robed multitude of Rev. vii. 14, are said to have come out of much tribulation, he at once determines that the white robe is the martyrs' garb and that the sitters upon thrones must all have come out of the tribulation of martyrdom. But a little examination would have proved, that while martyrs are arrayed in white, the white robe is not peculiar to them. In the very passage referred to, it is said that their robes were made white in the blood of the Lamb; but all who truly believe are washed clean from every defilement in that same fountain. In Rev. xix. 8; it is said of the Lamb's wife, "to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the RIGHTEOUSNESS OF SAINTS," unless it be shown that none belong to the bride, and that none are recog-

nised as saints but such as either passed, or were actually ready to pass through martyrdom, it cannot be maintained that the white robed armies who follow the Lamb, and who are evidently identified by their raiment with the bride, were either martyrs in fact or in intent. True it is, indeed, that these white-stoled attendants on Messiah are all conquerors. "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment," Rev. iii. 5. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne," verse 21, but before Christ addresses this promise to the Laodiceans he counsels them, and that too, or ere their victory can be achieved, to buy of him *white raiment* that they may *be clothed, and that the shame of their nakedness do not appear*. But what is this conquest? "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God," 1 John v. 4, 5. The beloved disciple was assuredly directed to pen these words, at once to shed light upon his own prophecy, and to add to our comfort and joy of faith. Again, he writes, *Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them*, the spirits proceeding out of the Antichrist; "because greater is he that is in you than he that is in the world," 1 John iv. 4. Besides, is it not written by another apostle—"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us," Rom. vii. 35, 37. Here, indeed, we are presented with a long enumeration of every description of sorrow, that can arise to put the steadfastness of faith to trial and the unquenchable love of Christ to the test. Most graciously is conquest, yea more than conquest ensured to all, who are troubled, including martyrs, but not excluding others. I, therefore, can discover no ground for the limitation that has been contended for, though I readily admit, nay maintain, on the general tenor of Scripture, that it is through much tribulation the way to the kingdom lieth; and that their's is a perilous state who know nothing of it, or who court the world in order to avoid it. Let there be an unflinching confession of Jesus and trouble will follow; but let us not restrict the fellowship of the believer with Jesus in his sufferings, to external trials. Many, on whom no frown of man ever alighted, have had the deepest experience of *his* sorrows, who wept over Jerusalem, and whose heart bled for the wretchedness of a world that was estranged from God. In addition

to the argument to be derived from the character of the white robed sufferers, who gain the conquest, which they undertake, I would add that the promise, which they attain to, is sure to all the seed. *"If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."* Gal. iii. 29. The Patriarchs, the Prophets, and all who *obtained a good report* of old, "through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. xi. 39, 40. 'Tis true many of these endured the fire of persecution, but many are enumerated who endured none. *Faith* is the criterion of heirship referred to; and the possessors of that faith yet await the time with patience when they are to be *made perfect* conjointly with us, i. e. with all *who have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*, for to all such are given *exceeding great and precious promises, that by these they might be partakers of the divine nature*, and therefore of the divine inheritance. 2 Pet. 1, 3, 4. The kingdom of heaven is entailed on all *the poor in spirit*, the heirship of earth belongeth to all *the meek*—the vision of God shall be enjoyed by all *the pure in heart*—the *peace-makers* are all the children of God, and if children, then heirs; so that the *poor in spirit*—the *meek*—the *pure in heart*—the *peace-makers*—as well as those *who are persecuted for righteousness sake*, are all persons of whom we may affirm *their's is the kingdom of heaven*. Matt. v. 3—10. What is denoted by the expression, the kingdom of heaven, will perhaps come under consideration. But I proceed to examine more closely the contested passage, and beg to lay it before you, as exhibited in Mr. R. Roe's forthcoming Analytical Arrangement of the Apocalypse, where it is laid down according to the laws of the Hebrew parallelism.*

* "Mr. Boys, in the portions of Scripture which he has arranged, first exhibits the corresponding parts in such visible form as to be obvious at a glance; and then subjoins, in similar form, a summary of their respective topics. It is a common practice to write metrical compositions in this manner, for the purpose of shewing both the species of verse, and the order of their occurrence; and, if this is advantageous in the case of sound only, how much more so in that of the sense. It is indeed only so far as this process is mentally performed, that a single sentence can be understood; and though this may be sufficient on all common occasions, yet in the case of the Bible, in which every word has weight, and in which the correspondences pervade every part, with unequalled regularity, variety and beauty, every possible help is desirable. In short, I consider it as the most effective instrument that has yet been put into our hands; that it is capable of turning the scale on most doubtful questions; that by its means the reader often obtains, from bare inspection, a clearer and more comprehensive view of the subject than from long and elaborate commentaries; and that, till an arrangement agreeable to it, of the entire volume of Scripture is completed, we shall not make the nearest possible approach either to the best translation or the most correct interpretation."

SUBDIVISIONS OF REVELATIONS, XX. 4, 5

And I saw {

a 1 | Thrones, { and they sat on them,
b 1 | { and judgment was given to them,*

a 2 | and the souls of those { d 1 | who had been beheaded { for the testimony of Jesus,
{ d 2 | and whoever { had not worshipped { and for the word of God,†

b 2 { and they lived } with Christ, { had not worshipped { not his image, { on their forehead
{ and reigned } c 1 | the thousand years. { and had not received the mark } and on their hand;‡

a 3 | But the rest of the dead
b 3 | lived not again
c 2 | till the thousand years were ended.

* Rev. xi. 18,—2 Tim. iv. 8. † Rev. vi. 9. ‡ Rev. iv. 11.

TOPICS.

General. { a 1 | Thrones.
 b 1 | Sitting and judging.

Particular. { a 2 | Souls: description, { d 1 | positive.
 d 2 | negative.
 b 2 | Living and reigning.
 c 1 | Time.
 { a 3 | Rest of the dead.
 b 3 | Not living.
 c 2 | Time.

You will observe two objects were presented to the Apostles' view, 1st.—*Thrones* occupied by judges, who are neither named nor described; and 2ndly.—*Souls*, ψυχαι, of whom a description is given both positively and negatively. As the *Thrones*, which were seen occupied, are parallel to the *Souls* who are so minutely described; so is the *sitting and judging* on the former, parallel to the *living and the reigning* of the latter; and are not to be confounded, as if they relate to the same persons or to the same circumstances. In the second member of the parallelism, the living saints are included and described negatively (d. 2.) along with those (d. 1.) who had been cut off in that same persecution, under which they also had been found faithful though they escaped the sword. The former member of the parallelism (a 1.) had been itself abundantly sufficient, to have included all these different parties, had it not been the Lord's will to have afforded special encouragement and consolation to such of his dear children, as shall be exposed to the last fiery trial of Antichrist, now speedily about to be developed. The fact that they also shall live and reign with Christ, is therefore expressed in terms that admit of no doubt; and they occupy, accordingly, so prominent a place in the prediction, that some would confine its gracious promise exclusively to them. In adopting such a limitation, they are neither justified by the passage itself, nor by the context, nor by the general scope of Scripture.—I have further to remark on the passage, that the verb (ἐκαθίσαν) *they sat*, having no nominative expressed, must be taken impersonally and include all who shall so sit on thrones and judge; but these are described to be the whole body of the saints, 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 8, &c.; and therefore all the saints shall so sit and so judge. Let it not be supposed that because the verb is plural it cannot be taken impersonally. I offer you the following examples of plural verbs, which must all, of necessity, be taken impersonally, from the structure of the sentences, in which they occur. Thus, good measure it is said *shall men give into your bosom*, Luke vi. 38; the word *men* has been supplied—no nominative is expressed—the verb is δατυουσιν. Again, *thou fool this night do they require thy soul of thee*, Luke xii. 20,* *marg.* Our translators, however, saw that ἀπαλειψουσιν must be impersonally taken. A very remarkable instance of the same structure occurs Luke xvi. 9, “they may receive you into everlasting habitations”—the nominative, which has been so unfortunately supplied to the verb, δεξαντες has led to considerable misapprehension of the sense. Two instructive examples of this mode of writing oc-

* Sed frustra quærent veteres de quibus hoc dicatur. Est enim personales pro impersonali, aut activum pro Passivo. Grotius, in Poli Synopsis: in loco.

cur in the Apocalypse itself. The fugitive and persecuted woman had a place prepared for her of God, *that they should feed her* τρεφωσιν, 1260 days, Rev. xii. 6, i. e. she was to be fed during that period of time. Lastly, “blessed is, that watcheth and keepeth his garments lest he walk naked and they see his shame,”—lest who see it? To the word *see* βλεπωσι there can be no nominative understood, and the sense obviously is, lest his shame become an object of general observation. But though all these plural verbs are taken impersonally, yet do they imply a numerical whole, which acteth the part ascribed to the unexpressed and unintimated nominative. By some considerable body shall the shame of the naked be discerned—the woman be fed—the faithful distributors of mammon be received—the soul of the fool be required—the benevolent be benevolently treated—and the thrones be occupied. But for the knowledge of that body, in each particular case, we must be indebted to the general statements of Scripture and not to the sentence alone in which the action is attributed to it.

Consideration the second.—“The description which the Holy Ghost has given, respecting the *duration* of the reigning, appears to me another reason for believing it is not the same as the reigning of the saints with Christ, after his second coming. If this passage were intended to foretell such a reigning of the saints after their resurrection, as would be immediately connected with, and precede their reigning *for ever*; I feel convinced we should have met with some express declaration upon this subject; and that the mode of expression in verse 4, would have been somewhat of this kind: “and they lived and reigned with Christ a (*Greek* the) thousand years and for ever and ever.” I should expect this both, &c.”—With conjectural expectations it is in vain to contend, as it is also improper to come, to the examination of Scripture. Here, however, we have a positive misapprehension of what is actually written. We are not given any direct information as to the *duration of the reign* in this place. That which we are instructed in the actual duration of, is the term of Satan’s incarceration. This being limited to a thousand years, during the which the rest of the dead do not rise, it is said, not concerning the occupation of the thrones, but concerning those who were faithful during the tyranny of the beast, that they also lived and reigned with Christ **THE** thousand years—which is widely different from the conjectured statement, that they *only* lived and reigned **A** thousand years, to the idea that their reign is limited to that time. They exercise uninterrupted authority while Satan is bound—when loosed for a little season he interferes with that authority, and endeavours to re-establish his usurpation on the

ruins of their empire, and accordingly he leads up his deluded victims against the camp of the saints. But what is the issue? Does he succeed in his daring exploit? Does he hurl them from the thrones they occupy? No such thing. He cannot compete with heaven. Fire comes down from God and devours his rebel hosts, while he, himself, is cast anew into the lake of fire where the beast and the false prophet are. The inroad on their realms is effectually and for ever defeated, and the saints continue in the possession of their covenant-established dominion. In a note the error is pushed to an extreme, on the authority of an anonymous author: "When I consider that a period of a thousand years bears a less proportion to eternity, than the smallest grain of sand does to the whole earth; and that the saints are to live for eternity, I *never can conceive* that the Holy Ghost has given such numerous and glorious descriptions, concerning the state of the saints during the period of a thousand years, and has left the infinitely more important eternity wrapped up in darkness, &c." No man's conceptions are to be the gauge by which we are to measure the wisdom, whereby the Holy Ghost may contrive to acquaint us with the divine purposes, or the method he pursues in making known to us things to come. The Socinian might, with equal force, bring in his conceptions to interpret what is written. The question can never be what any man thinks, but what God has taught. In this case, however, the period is only introduced to denote the probationary term allotted to the devil-freed world, under the reign of Christ and his saints, during which the rest of the dead are suffered to remain unjudged in Hades.

Consideration the third.—"The promise given in verse 6, concerning those who *partake of the first resurrection*; namely, *on such the second death hath no power*, would also lead me to conceive, that these persons do not signify the saints risen and reigning in their glorified bodies." This idea is the very opposite of consideration the first, where the difficulty was represented to be, that former promises were not reiterated—here the difficulty is, that they are repeated. The promise being given to the saints, while living in their mortal bodies, that they should not taste the second death, it is thought superfluous to repeat it "with reference to the risen saints!" The assurance, however, that the second death has no power on those who partake of the first resurrection, being one that is addressed to them while living here in their mortal bodies is far from being superfluous, and is plainly designed for their comfort, while awaiting the promise of the life to come. It is not deemed superfluous, or inappropriate to his risen state to say, that *Christ*

being raised from the dead dieth no more, (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔτι κυριεύει) death domineers no longer over him, Rom. vi. 9, and if it be not inappropriate or superfluous thus to speak of the risen members, neither can it be so to affirm of the risen members, *over such the Death the second possesses no authority.* Our Lord, when speaking of his members, as *worthy to obtain that age, and the resurrection, that out of dead ones*, deems it neither inappropriate nor superfluous to speak of them, in the enjoyment of that resurrection, as persons, who *cannot die any more*, οὐτε γὰρ ἀποθᾶ νεν ἔτι δύνανται, Luke xx. 36, and how then can it be either inappropriate or superfluous to speak of them as persons, over whom *the death the second possesses no authority?* So far is it from being either inappropriate or superfluous to speak of them after this wise, that had the fact not been made a matter of promise and revelation, we could never, with certainty, have known that their enjoyment of the resurrection would involve their complete and perpetual exemption from so fearful a calamity. Even thus viewed, the objection embodied in *consideration the third* is evidently fallacious. It is put somewhat more strongly thus, to those who are in this life, exposed to the *first* death it is promised “he that overcometh shall not be hurt of the *second* death.” Hence the superfluousness, if I might so speak, of such a promise in reference to the *risen* and *glorified* saints, and its peculiar suitableness and actual previous application by the Spirit, to *suffering* saints *before* the first death, and exposed thereto, would confirm my conviction that the reigning with Christ cannot signify that of the saints with their glorified bodies.” We have already despatched the question of the superfluousness of such a statement with reference to the risen saints. I now proceed to show that the whole argument is based upon the erroneous conception that the passage before us is a promise at all.—It is narrative and not promise—prophetic narrative penned not for the instruction of *risen* saints, but for the comfort of *suffering* saints. The words are consecutive to the prophecy of the *first* resurrection, and are as follows:—“He is blessed and holy who has part in the resurrection the first. Over these the death the second has no authority, but they shall be priests of God, even Messiah, and shall reign with him a thousand years. Here is nothing of an address to the living but an extract from an historical prophecy, styled “the revelation of Jesus Christ,” and which John was commanded to write in a book and to send to the seven churches. It states as a fact concerning certain persons, who share in “the resurrection the first,” that “the death the second,” which is evidently opposed thereunto, HAS no authority, exercises no control over them, οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν. This statement supposes that *the death the*

second, is, at the time spoken of, in the actual possession of dominion. But *the death the second* is described to be the same thing with the casting of the ungodly into the Lake of fire. Rev. xx. 14. Now the first time when in the exercise of retributive justice, ungodly persons are cast into it, and thus subjected to the dominion of *the death the second*, is on the discomfiture of the Beast and the False Prophet. Till the Beast and the False Prophet therefore, are cast into the Lake of fire, *the death the second* will have no subjects, and will exercise in consequence no dominion. There could be nothing peculiar affirmed, respecting any class of persons at present, were we to say of them, that *the death the second* has no power over them, for he has no power over any, since the Beast and the False Prophet are not yet consigned to the Lake of fire. But after that event it will be a striking peculiarity, in the case of the risen saints, that notwithstanding their previous descent to Hades, *the death the second* has no power over them. The introduction of this tremendous tyrant in the exercise of power, but yet a power which reaches not to the saints, and therefore, interfereth not with the sovereignty they exercise, when placed on thrones, and in possession of the crown which the righteous judge shall award them, is a strong corroborative testimony to the literal interpretation of the first Resurrection. Their jurisdiction is independent of his, and his independent of theirs. Both exercise authority at the same period, but over widely different realms.

Consideration the fourth.—"If the first resurrection be interpreted to signify the resurrection of the saints, then "the rest of the dead," in ver. 5, and "the dead, small and great," in ver. 12, must be interpreted to signify the *ungodly* dead; and to be the same the one as the other. It appears to me, however, that "the rest of the dead" cannot be interpreted to be the same as "the dead, small and great," because the expressions are so widely different. I cannot but conceive, that if the Holy Ghost had intended the same persons in ver. 5, and ver. 12, he would have given the same description in each, and that ver. 12 would have been, "and I saw the rest of the dead stand before God," &c. We have here another instance of his conception of what the Holy Ghost would have said, had he really intended to convey a certain meaning. But I pass this over. It is by a considerable bound, the conclusion was reached, that the *ungodly* being denoted by "the rest of the dead," must also be denoted by "the dead, small and great." It demanded a pause before so hasty a stride was taken. The *ungodly* being understood to be "the rest of the dead," must doubtless be included amongst "the dead, small and great,"

who are brought up finally for judgment; but wherefore is it that this latter expression must needs be confined to them? There is a change indeed, in the form of expression, but may there not be abundant reason for it differing essentially from that contemplated by Mr. Gipps. A thousand years intervene between the period when "the rest of the dead" are doomed not to live again, till the expiration of that remarkable epoch, and the time when "the dead, small and great," are led up to the White Throne. Is it not possible that in so great a space of time the invisible world may receive a considerable increase of inhabitants from amongst the mortal dwellers upon earth, over whom the saints shall reign? Great longevity indeed, will be restored to man, but still death is to exist during the Millennium. The child of a hundred years shall die. That mortality will then take place, is determined by these Scriptures amongst others. Isa. lxx. 20; Ezek. xlv. 25, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 26. Had verse 12 merely stated that "the rest of the dead," as described in verse 5, who had died before the thousand years began, stood before God, it would not have included those, who shall die during the thousand years.—But this is not so.

Consideration the fifth.—"The time when "the rest of the dead lived again," in ver. 5, appears to me equally to differ from the time when "the dead, small and great stand before God," in ver. 12. It seems to me to be clearly implied that the resurrection "of the rest of the dead," signified in ver. 5, will take place after "the ending of the thousand years;" at the same time that Satan is "loosed from his prison," ver. 7. But "the dead, small and great, stand before God," not after the ending of the thousand years, but of the intervening period described ver. 7, to 10. Consequently this cannot be the same as the "living again of the rest of the dead," described in ver. 5. but must be separated from it by this intervening period." That the resurrection of the rest of the dead will take place after the expiration of the thousand years, admits of no doubt, but the sense intended to be conveyed by the phrase, that it will take place "after the ending" of those years is not, that it will merely be subsequent to their expiration, but that it will immediately take place when they come to a close. Two assumptions are involved in their statement: the *first* is, that "the rest of the dead" arise at the very moment in which the thousand years expire, and the *second* is, that the judgment before the great white throne does not occur till after the destruction of Gog and Magog. The first assumption rests on the force of the word *until*. It is written, "the rest of the dead lived not again, UNTIL the thousand years were finished." If this prediction conveys the idea of their immediate resurrection, from

the force of the word *until*, then have we often employed this word in a very loose manner. But let us put it to the test. It was prophesied by Jacob;—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah; nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come." Gen. xlix. 10. Did this take place immediately upon Shiloh's appearance? Judea did not become a Roman Province till eleven years after Messiah's birth, and though then incorporated with Syria, the Jews were still suffered to retain their own polity, nor was it wholly subverted till the fall of Jerusalem. The young maidens who directed Saul in his quest for the Seer, said to him and his servant; "as soon as ye be come into the city, ye shall straightway find him, before he go up to the high place to eat, for the people will not eat until he come, because he doth bless the sacrifice, and afterwards they eat that be bidden." 1 Sam. ix. 13. Does this imply that immediately on the appearance of the Seer, the people all began to eat? Even after their important colloquy, and after Samuel had placed the destined Monarch and his Servant in the most honourable seat in the parlour, a delay arose, till the reserved joint was served up for the extraordinarily honoured guests. When Artaxerxes wrote to the Samaritans saying;—"Give ye now commandment to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded, until another commandment shall be given from me," Ezra iv. 19, did he give them to understand, that on issuing *that* prospective decree, the city should arise immediately in all her fair proportions? With just as fair shew of reason might it be argued, that Samuel went to see Saul on the day of his death, 1 Sam. xv. 35; that the apostles immediately departed from Jerusalem, when they were endued with power from on high, Luke xxiv. 49; and that Mary ceased to be a Virgin the very moment she brought forth her first-born Son, Matt. i. 25. The *second assumption* supposes, that because the judgment before the great white throne is *related* after the destruction of Gog and Magog, it must therefore, be subsequent to that event. This assumption can only arise from an entire ignorance of the structure of the Apocalypse. It is far from being a continuous record of events, *successively* to ensue. As well might we argue, that because the second advent is noticed in Rev. i. 7, all that is related subsequently as happening, in the book is posterior to that event. The subsequently related events may, or may not be posterior, but this must first be demonstrated before any inference, can legitimately be drawn from it. My own opinion is, that the two events in question are coetaneous. There is no mark given, by which we can certainly decide that they do not synchronize. However the idea on which he resolves that they are consecutive, might have been urged with great weight

against the writer himself. According to him, we have the coming of Christ, and the simultaneous resurrection of the just and of the unjust, and their respective dooms described in Rev. xx. 11, 15. But by his theory also, the descent of the Saints, under the symbol of New Jerusalem, is described in the second verse of the succeeding chapter. They however come with Christ, the living Saints being caught up the while to meet them. 1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. If the prophecy therefore, be a consecutive narrative of events, gradually to be unfolded in the very order of their prediction, we must at once come to the conclusion, either that the Judgment before the White Throne is anterior to the coming of Christ with his Saints, and is descriptive of something widely different from the transactions, which shall occur on the descent of the Holy City; or else that the descent of the Holy City, as a bride adorned for her husband, is the symbolical representation, not of those blessed souls who shall accompany the Lord on his return, but of some event posterior to their resurrection and appearing.

Consideration the sixth.—"The omission of any declaration as to "the sea, death, and the grave giving up the dead" at the first resurrection, and the making such a declaration respecting the dead, in ver. 13, convinces me both that the "first resurrection" is not that of the saints, and also, that the dead in vers. 12, 13, include all mankind, both the saints and the ungodly." Let us attend to the process of reasoning, for at the first sight the reason here put forward, is far from obvious. "In every other part of the word of God, the information given concerning the resurrection of the Saints is not only much more frequent, but also much more explicit, than concerning the resurrection of the ungodly. I feel convinced; therefore, that in this portion also of Scripture, if it were intended to foretell a resurrection of the saints distinct from that of the ungodly, more explicit information would be given concerning the former, than concerning the latter. I find, however, that the information given, concerning "the first resurrection," instead of being much *more*, is much *less* explicit, than that concerning the resurrection intimated in ver. 12, 13, for there is not the least allusion to the "sea, death, and the grave giving up the dead" at the first resurrection, and it is expressly declared, that they do this at the time of the resurrection set forth in ver. 12, 13." Are the *sea, death, and the grave*, synonymous with the saints? Or is it essential that these objects should enter into the explicit delineation of the saints at their resurrection? It appears to me that we are given far more explicit information concerning them, when they are described as *sitting on thrones, and judging*,

as *living and reigning with Christ* the thousand years, than what we should have been, had we been only taught to believe, that the various receptacles of their mouldering and mouldered bodies, had yielded those bodies up. Might there not, however, be some wise and important reason for omitting the notice of their various burial places, and fixing the attention exclusively on the site of their united glory? Are they not one and all represented as sleeping in Jesus, as having one common place of repose, as being collected into the common repository of the Saviour's body, and as having risen with him virtually, when he burst the sepulchre, and would it not therefore, have been unmeet to have represented them here as the yet unrisen, as distributed into various masses, and as divided in death amongst the various charnel-houses, which sea, death, and the grave afforded? Possessed of the glory that excelleth, the dark valley of the shadow of death, through which they had past, is forgotten, and nothing is remembered but the victory by which death was swallowed up; the victory by which the sting was extracted from the oppressor; the life, which having been hid in Jesus, was brought out into manifestation, when Christ, who is their life, had appeared, as the triumphant word of God, whereupon they accordingly had taken their covenanted seat with him upon his throne. Most richly fraught with comfort is the very omission, by which it is sought to overturn their possession of immortality, and their acquisition of incorruption, in the morning of the first resurrection. Most blessed is the thought, that the glory, which shall be revealed in us, is such and so great, that the sufferings of the present time, and our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, though that moment be death, are yet unworthy of notice by the inspiring spirit, when he would set forth our exceeding blessedness, as partakers of the first resurrection. It is very singular that this should be deemed a less explicit notice of the Saints, which setteth forth their glory as *enthroned*—as *judging the world*—as *living and reigning with Christ*, than a passage which merely describeth the resignation by the *sea*, *death*, and the *grave* of those, whose bodies they held in possession. Here the saints occupy the whole space in the view of the Prophet, who is so wrapt up with the contemplation of their exalted dignity that he despatches the whole mass of the ungodly, with the brief notice, "the rest of the dead." There, not a syllable occurs, which can be construed to describe the saints themselves, or the glory which they inherit; they are left without one explicit note to mark them, though they are said to be most explicitly held up to our consideration in the words *sea! death! grave!* Even the word *ανστασις* or resurrection, is not once met with, and yet

it twice occurs in the place where it is said they are entirely overlooked. Here, their future state as risen, is detailed. There, the past condition of the judged, as having been held previously by the sea, death, and the grave, is described, together with the doom of those, who are not written in the book of life, and who are cast into the lake of fire. Is this anything resembling explicit information concerning the saints?

Consideration the Seventh.—"Those which have been already adduced are confirmed by the introduction in verse 15 of the phrase of distinction, "whosoever was not found written in the book of life," in describing who are to be "cast into the lake of fire." There could be no occasion for this distinction unless these who are written in the book of life had formed a part of those, who *stood before God and were judged*. For otherwise *the dead*, in verse 12, would include only the ungodly; and consequently *all* the dead would, without exception, "be cast into the lake of fire." In this case the mode of expression in verse 15, would have been as general as in verse 12; and as verse 12 speaks of "the dead, small and great," standing before God, so verse 15 would have declared "and the dead, small and great, were cast into the lake of fire." I premise that all the dead who stand before God must be those who at that time were in the state of death. A false impression might be produced in the mind of the reader of this place that Millenarians were chargeable with the doctrine that all who die are cast into the lake of fire. This place is considered by them to represent the judgment simply of those, who remained in the state of death at the period of the first resurrection, and of all those who may have descended into that state after the first resurrection. It is rather an uncommon kind of proof to refer to those, who are "not written in the book of life," as evidences that ALL those who were *ever* written in the book of life are included in their description. The negation of particular qualities in any company of men does not imply the existence of those qualities in others with whom they may be associated. Still a marked distinction does exist between the statement of the dead who stand before the throne, and the dead who are cast into the lake of fire. That distinction, while it justifies not the idea that *all the living just*, at this time, stand before the throne, seems to result from what we remarked under *consideration the fourth*, that death will exist during the Millennium; and that children of an hundred years old, who are not accursed, will die. The names of these latter will, doubtless, be inscribed in the book of life; and to distinguish them from such, it is said of the dead, who stand before

the throne, that their names, not being written in the book of life, they are cast into the lake of fire. But observe, particularly, who they are, that are said to stand before the throne, and to be cast into the lake. They are *THE DEAD*—not persons raised from death and possessed anew of life, but persons still dead, who only exchange one form of death for another—not one word is there said in this place to indicate that the persons judged are made alive again. The resurrection of damnation is not a resurrection of life!

Consideration the Eighth.—"The declaration made in verse 12, concerning "the opening of the book of life," at the time when the dead are judged, and the reference made to it in verse 15, convince me that the first resurrection cannot signify the resurrection of the saints at the second coming of Christ. The opening of the book of life, as observed p. 11, appears to me to signify the manifestation of those who are written in it. Two reasons lead me to conceive, that this must take place at the second coming of Christ." The act of opening a book is the manifestation of nothing. When opened before a judge it is designed for reference and appeal. The publication, or the reading aloud of a registry, containing the names of individuals, appointed to favour or to office, would be the manifestative declaration of the good awarded them; and had it been stated in this place that such a publication was to be made, I should then acquiesce in the criticism, which describes the opening of the book to signify, "the manifestation of those who are written in it." But so far is this from being the case, I find the only use which it is described as subserving, is the making such an appeal to its pages as leads to the discovery of those *who have not been enrolled within it*, that they may be cast into the lake of fire. It is placed there as a book of reference, and does not symbolize the open manifestation of the saints, of whom no mention whatsoever is made. It may be as well to examine further the expression on which these remarks are founded—"the book of life." It is not peculiar to the Apocalypse. We meet it for instance in Phil. iv. 3, "others, my fellow labourers, whose names are written in the book of life." You are aware of the Jewish notion, that on the first day of the New Year, three books are always opened, not for the manifestation of character, but for the registration therein, respectively of the righteous, the middling, and the incorrigible, the righteous being immediately written to everlasting life. Upon leaving the synagogue the first night of the feast, they accordingly salute each other, saying, "to a good year shall ye be inscribed," to which the reply is, "and thou also." In their New Year's-Day service" this petition occurs, "remem-

ber us unto life, O King! delighted with the living; vouchsafe to write us in the book of life, for thine own sake, O God of life! the living God, the King, our Supporter, Saviour, and Protector." Now, though they have no authority for the existence of any such annual transaction, yet had Moses taught them that a record of the professedly righteous was kept by Jehovah, from which he blotteth out, from time to time, the names of the transgressors, who belie their profession. Very remarkable is the place I refer to. On the occasion of the golden-calf "Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them Gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin;—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book, which thou hast written. And the LORD said unto Moses, whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." *Exod. xxxii. 32, 33.*

* This affecting incident, which manifested such intense love in Moses for the children of his people, may further be illustrated by the threat denounced against the false prophets, *Ezek. xiii. 9.* "Mine hand shall be upon the prophets that see vanity, and that divine lies; they shall not be in the assembly, [or secret council,] of my people;" they shall not be taken into consultation—"in the good secret which is hidden from my people, they shall not be" *Targ.* "neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel." That writing cannot be the mere roll or register of those, who return from captivity, for that would only amount to the same thing, which is set forth in the succeeding denunciation, "neither shall they enter into the land of Israel." The Targum correctly expounds it, "in the writing of the life of the age, which is written for the

"* In the public registers, all that were born of a particular tribe were entered in the list of their respective families, under that tribe. This was the *Book of Life*; but when any of those died, his name might be considered as blotted out from this list. Our *baptismal registers*, which record the *births* of all the inhabitants of a particular *parish* or *district*, and which are properly our *books of life*; and our *bills of mortality*, which are properly our *books of death*, or the lists of those who are thus *blotted out* from our *baptismal register*, or *books of life*, are very significant and illustrative remains of the ancient registers, or *books of life* and *death*, among the *Jews*, the *Greeks*, the *Romans*, and most ancient nations. It is worthy of remark, that in China, the names of the persons who have been tried on criminal processes, are written in two distinct books, which are called the *book of life*, and the *book of death*; those who have been acquitted, or who have not been *capitally* convicted, are written in the *former*; those who have been found *guilty* in the *latter*. These two books are presented to the Emperor, by his Ministers, who, as Sovereign, has a right to erase any name from either; to place the *living* among the *dead* that he may die; or the *dead*, that is, the person condemned to death, among the *living*, that he may be preserved. Thus he *blots out* of the *book of life*, or the *book of death*, according to his Sovereign's pleasure, or the representation of his Ministers, or the intercession of friends, &c. An ancient, extremely rich picture, in my own possession, representing this circumstance, painted in China, was thus interpreted to me by a native of China."—Adam Clarke *in loco*.

righteous of the house of Israel, they shall not be written." Against the enemies of Messiah, just this very woe is denounced. Psalm lxi. 26, 28. "Let their habitation be desolate, and let none dwell in their tents, &c. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous." While therefore, the Jews have only tradition to support their notion of a periodical posting and balancing of the books, yet must the book of life be an ever-varying record, not detailing the names of those, who have secretly been chosen from the foundation of the world, but of those, who, by works are manifested to be such. They who overcome, are they alone who shall never be blotted out from thence. Rev. iii. 5. Herein it differs from the registry contained on Jehovah's palms, to which reference is had, in Rev. xvii. 8. So that at no two periods could it contain the same catalogue of persons. Opened at Armageddon, it would present a much narrower amount of the living saved, than what it will do, when opened at the expiration of the thousand years. Frightful was the obliteration of names from that book, when the deluge swept all the ungodly of the earth, and meagre, very meagre was the roll it contained then of living souls. Woe is me—another day yet more terrific is hastening on, when Jehovah, upon the full developement of Antichrist, shall proceed to expunge from thence, by one dread sweep of his obliterating pen, the names of all the deluded votaries of the embodied Dragon. May we be found watching!—In order to have established any thing from the argument drawn from the reference to this book, in Rev. xx. 11, 15, it should have been proved that the Book of life is only to be opened once;—that it is to be spread open to the gaze, and for the information of all the living, and of all the dead;—and that all the living, and all the dead, from the beginning of the creation to the close of all things, are included in the registry. But we are not told that this is the only juncture, upon which reference is to be had to this book of doom. We learn that it is spread open before the Judge, and not before those, who are arraigned at his bar. While so far are we from being told, that all who are then alive, and all who had ever died, shall then be judged according to their works, the judgment is expressly limited to *the dead small and great*, the small and great who are then dead, to the exclusion altogether, of those who are alive. If the saints at that time stand before the bar, as argued from the book of life being opened, they must then be included amongst the dead small and great. But when Christ comes, they will come with him, not as the dead, but as the reawakened sleepers, and as the changed living. They are clearly, therefore, not included in the de-

scription. Two reasons, which we have chiefly anticipated, were urged by Mr. Gipps, in confirmation of his view.—*First*, having stated the circumstances of Christ's coming, &c. he adds, "it is utterly inconceivable to me that all this glory can be conferred upon the saints, and such a manifestation of them be made in the presence of Christ, of all the holy angels, of one another, and of all the ungodly living in every part of the earth one moment before what is called the opening of the book of life." It is no argument, as applied to revelation, that any portion of what God has been pleased to communicate of his purposes, to his creatures, is inconceivable to any or to all of them. That which occasioned the difficulty of conception in this case, however, was the misapprehension of what was meant by the opening of the book of life—and by the book of life itself. Again, although the glory, which shall be revealed *in us*, will be visible to the ungodly, it is not before the ungodly, dead, or living, but before the father and *his* angels, Christ has promised to confess those, whom he will not blot out of the book of life. Rev. iii. 5. But we have still to consider the other reason. "*Secondly*.—It is expressly set forth that the *manifestation* of the *sons of God* will take place at their resurrection. Rom. viii. 19, 23. As therefore, I am convinced that this manifestation cannot take place before the book of life is opened, in which their names are written, but must be the same as the discovery of those who are written therein, I feel assured, that the resurrection of the saints will be at the time of the *opening of the book of life*, and not at the *resurrection*." I could not desire a more convincing passage to disprove the scheme which Mr. Gipps thus vindicated, than the passage to which he has here referred us. Strange that he should have endeavoured to make the judgment before the great white throne, synchronize with the manifestation of the sons of God. Rom. viii. 19, 23. The judgment before the great white throne, in his view of it, coincided with the conflagration of the world; its actual annihilation;—but the manifestation of the sons of God, according to St. Paul, is so far from being coetaneous with the dissolution of the frame of nature, that he describes that event as introductory to the deliverance of creation from her involuntary bondage to corruption, the *sign* for which she longeth, in this season of her travail pains, as the assurance of her approaching exemption from all physical and moral evil by sin engendered.*

8. The argument from authority, as shewing the judgment of the primitive church, has been drawn from the three ancient creeds, called the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian. What the judgment of the church in those days really was cannot be

* See Appendix.

learned from these sources. Those creeds do not express the idea that at the very moment of Christ's re-appearing he will judge all the living and all the dead. They simply express the idea, as doth the Scripture, that he will come for this purpose, but do not undertake to specify either the order or the duration of the judgment. In fact they confine themselves as much as possible to the very words of Scripture and offer nothing in the way of exposition. It is not, however, from the translation of these creeds, that we can so easily determine the point, as from an inspection of the Greek originals. In the Apostles' Creed it is said, "from thence he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead." *μελλει ερχεσθαι κριναι ζωντας και νεκρους.* *He is about to come to judge living ones and dead ones.* This corresponds *verbatim* with the words of 1 Tim. iv. 1. (*του μελλοντος κρινειν ζωντας και νεκρους.*) But herein we have only an expression of his purpose to execute the office whereunto he is appointed as, (*κριτης ζωντων και νεκρων,*) judge of living ones and dead ones, Acts x. 42. But that the creed itself, or the Scriptures, from which the words of the creed are taken, express an instantaneous judgment of all the living and of all the dead, on his appearing, is certainly not the case. I find his coming to judge the living detailed at length in the *third* and *fourth* chapters of the prophet Malachi. There is there no notice of the dead, as simultaneously called to judgment, and much is related of the purification of Levi, of the conversion of Israel, of the fertilization of their land and of other matters, which evince that the day of his coming, though dreadful in its dawn to the proud and those who do wickedly, will be attended with the most gracious results to earth; and that though it will be ushered in with speed, by his suddenly appearing in his temple, it will be mercifully protracted to pour out a blessing from the open windows of heaven. I might pass through all the prophets, and show from their concurrent testimony, that the appearing of our great God and Saviour, as described by them, is ever set forth as leading to many and wonderful results, affecting our world, as ushering in a long reign of righteousness, and the continuous unintermitted exercise of true judgment. When, therefore, I express my belief that Christ will come to judge the living, I express my belief that he will come to execute all that judgment on, and to exercise all that justice in the earth, which the prophets assure me he will do. It must be shewn therefore, from other evidence than that contained in the Apostles' Creed, that the primitive church put a different construction upon such Scriptures as these, than what I and other Millenarians are induced to do. The same remarks apply to the *Nicene* creed, where, however, it is additionally stated, that

Christ will come WITH GLORY to judge living ones and dead ones, and that his *kingdom shall have no end*, which is quoted from Luke i. 33; but this does not apply to the present point. But in the *Alhanasian* creed this further remark is added, "at whose coming all men shall rise again, with their bodies, and shall give an account of their own works." This might seem at first view to intimate the simultaneous resurrection of all mankind at the very moment of the Saviour's appearing—at *his coming* being an expression that seems equivalent to the juncture of his arrival, but in the Greek the words are ΟΥ ΤΗ ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΙ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΗΣΟΥΝΤΑΙ. Now the word παρουσία does not imply the mere notion of his arrival but the fact of his being present. In this sense we meet with it, Thess. ii. 19, *are not even ye εμπροσθεν before our Lord Jesus Christ, εν τη αυτου παρουσια, in his presence*. It is not doubted, by any, that during the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ all human kind shall stand forth, and give account of the things done in the body. In conclusion I would remark, that the circumstance of Christ being the judge of the quick and the dead, derives much light from the parallel statement in Rom. xiv. 9. To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, *ινα και νεκρων και ζωντων κυριευση, that he might EXERCISE LORDSHIP over both dead and living ones*. (Compare Luke xxii. 25, where it is used to signify the exercise of royal authority by the *kings of the Gentiles*.) This gives the true idea of his being appointed to judge the quick and the dead. His being appointed to this office is no more than what he said himself, "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father had appointed unto me," Luke xxii. 25. It is remarkable that this information was graciously vouchsafed to them on the very occasion, when he spake of the present exercise of authority by the Gentile Kings, in opposition to which they were to stand forth in living contrast, as those that serve; the thrones, upon which they were to sit *judging the twelve tribes of Israel*, being reserved for another dispensation, in which he also shall judge and reign. I might rebut the argument from authority still further by appealing to the ample testimonies of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen, but this has amply been done already, and I decline therefore entering upon it.

LETTER II.

PARABLES.—Wheat and Tares—Criticism on the expression *Kingdom of Heaven*, illustrated by *grain of mustard seed*—Confounding the judgment on the wicked quick, and on the wicked dead, cause of error—Harvest and Vintage, Joel ii. 3, 11.—The Draw Net—The Marriage Supper—Talents—Judgment, illustrated by reference to Dan. vii. 13—The words *Nations*—*Saints* explained—*Goats* and *Sheep*, Ezek. xxxiv. 10, 31. Mic. iv. 6, 8.

The second chapter of Mr. Gipps' book is valuable for the example it affords of an appeal to that part of Scripture, (the Parables) which the opposers of Christ's personal reign on earth with his saints, generally avoid upon the plea that no argument can be drawn from them. The success which has attended our excellent author's excursion into the region of parable, has by no means equalled the boldness of the attempt, or the excellence of the design.

WHEAT AND TARES.

He commences with the parable of the *wheat* and the *tares*. Most unpropitious is the result. In opposition to the *points* he has collected out of this instructive discourse, I gather the following:—The period at which the action of the parable is laid is *the end of the age* (*αἰὼς*)—the field that is then reaped is the world (*κοσμος*) and not Hades. Of the generations who had previously passed away, or of the resurrection of the dead, just or unjust, not one syllable is said—the scene of the Son of Man's kingdom, or the territory it is to embrace, is the world, the field that is to be reaped, (the doers of iniquity are to be gathered out of *his* kingdom, v. 41,) the reapers are the messengers of the Son of Man himself, and not of the Father, before whom he will confess his own faithful confessors; the world is not only here represented as the kingdom of the Son, the visible administrator of divine sovereignty for the Father, but also as the scene over which the righteous shall exercise power, "then shall the righteous shine forth as **THE SUN** in the kingdom of their Father." Remember our daily prayer—"thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, &c. The kingdom of heaven, in this parable, is resembled not to the world, nor to the tares, nor yet to the sowers, but to the gathered wheat—the righteous in their manifested glory as the *Sun*, the well known symbol of supreme power.

I beg to observe that βασιλεια denotes the *regia potestas*, or su-

preme power, as well as the *regnum* or *kingdom*. For this use of the term Scapula refers to Plato and Xenophon. This is the sense in which I believe it to be chiefly employed in Scripture, but particularly in the parables. By the *kingdom of the heavens*, I therefore understand the SUPERNAL RULERS. It must, for instance, be so considered in the parable, immediately following, of the grain of mustard seed. The church seminally contained in and undergoing death with Jesus, gradually developed and producing fruit till it acquires its full maturity, is then presented to view not as being subjected itself to authority, but as affording protection to the fowl of heaven. It is the very counterpart of Nebuchadnezzar's tree, which was interpreted of himself as the supreme ruler, Dan. iv. 22, 23. As men are symbolized by seed in the parable of the wheat and tares, so here the mustard-seed is the seed of the woman, the seed of Abraham, and the tree Christ himself and his spiritual branches—see John xii. 24. It will be material to bear these remarks in mind, as also the following observation of Schleusner on the word βασιλεια 7. ponitur pro βασιλευς rex, abstracto posito pro concreto; Mark xi. 10. ευλογημενη η ερχομενη βασιλεια τε πατρος ημων δαβιδ, coll. Luke xix. 38. ευλογημενος ο ερχομενος βασιλευς Apoc. i. 6, &c. Eadem modo ιερατευμα pro ιερευσ ponitur 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

It having been a mere assumption that the parable related to the resurrection, while it could only concern the rapture of the saints, his *first inference* falls to the ground, as does also the *second*. But I observe, that with regard to this parable and his inferences from many other parables, he was deceived by the analogy between the judgment on the ungodly living at Armageddon, and on the wicked dead before the white throne. The devil, who deceived the nations after the thousand years were ended, is represented as being cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet were thrown before the thousand years began. There are, therefore, two different committals to this lake. Of the first we have not only the record in Rev. xix. 20, but in a great variety of the Old Testament Scriptures, particularly Isa. lxvi. 16, 24; Zech. xiv. 12. The mere circumstance, therefore, of a judgment being mentioned which may correspond with either of these, is not sufficient in itself to determine to which of these events it refers. If it be a judgment on the living, it must be referred to Armageddon; if it be a judgment on the dead it must be referred to the great white throne. Now in the parable of the tares and wheat it is evidently the living at the time of the coming of the Son of Man, who are described as the subjects of the judgment; this will appear not only from what has been already remarked, but also from a prophetic coincidence Mr. Gipps failed to no-

tice. That coincidence is the vision of the *white cloud* with the Son of Man seated thereon, and the description of the harvest and vintage which ensues, Rev. xiv. 14, 16. While one angel reaps the harvest, another gathers the vine of the earth by the command of him who has *power over fire*, and casts the ripe clusters into the great winepress of the wrath of God.—Again I meet with an intimation of a judgment described with similar imagery and corresponding in point of time in Joel iii. When the wonders described in the preceding chapter are brought to pass, the sun darkened and the moon converted into blood, (by which symbols I understand the obscuration of the Sun of righteousness during the reign of the personal Antichrist—and the synchonical martyrdom of the church, *in those days, and in that time* when the captivity of Judah shall be restored, then it is written “I will gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehosaphat, and will plead with them there, for my people, and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land,” v. 2. The Prophet having adverted to some preliminary events, issues the summons for this fearful gathering of the nations, and adds, “assemble yourselves, and come all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause *thy mighty ones* to come down *O Lord*. Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. *Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come, get you down, for the press is full, the fats overflow;* for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision; for the day of the Lord is near, in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The LORD also, shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake, but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the LORD, your God, *dwelling in Zion*, my holy mountain; then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the LORD, and shall water the valley of Shittim. Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence against the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land. But Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. For I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed, for the Lord dwelleth in Zion.” 11, 21.

Now from this prophecy I gather the following information. At the time of Israel's restoration, there is to be a judicial harvest and vintage, corresponding with the judgment on the tares; the Gentile nations, of whom Egypt and Edom are particularly noticed, are to be cut off, for their violence against Judah, and the innocent blood they have shed; the agents in the execution of this judgment, are to be the *mighty ones* of Jehovah—Jesus, the hope and strength of Israel, corresponding with the messengers of the Son of Man in the parable of the wheat and the tares, with the impalpable and immaterial hosts of the Lords, commonly but improperly called locusts, who come as a thief and before whom a fire burneth, described Joel ii. 3, 8—11—with the SANCTIFIED ONES, the MIGHTY ONES, for Jehovah's *anger who rejoice in his highness*, and who, with the noise of a multitudinous host, mustered by Jehovah for the battle, come against Babylon, "from a far country, from the end of heaven, even Jehovah and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land," or, "all the wicked of the earth" as the Targum. Isai. xiii. 2—5, comp. Isa. xxxiii. 4; Psalm cxlix. 5—9; Mal. iv. 3. The symbolical heavens are to be eclipsed—Jehovah is then to take up his permanent abode in Zion—strangers shall no more make a thoroughfare of Jerusalem—exuberant fertility shall distinguish the whole of the promised territory—a stream which takes its rise in the Lord's house, shall water the valley of Shittim, corresponding with that foretold, Ezek. xlvii. 1—5. The Jews shall uninterruptedly enjoy their own land for ever, the blood of Messiah, which they invoked on their own nation, and for the shedding of which they have already suffered so fearfully, shall at length be cleansed; and Jehovah dwell in Zion, a fact from which the city shall thenceforth take its very name. Ezek. xlviii. 35. I have been thus particular in recapitulating the evidence contained in this prediction, because it not only affirms that the harvest and vintage concern the living nations, who shall be gathered in the valley of Jehoshaphat, but because the consequences to Edom, Egypt, Palestine, and the Jewish People, are such, as to forbid that the idea, for a single moment, should be entertained, that the judgment could be followed by the conflagration of the globe, or the annihilation of the world.

But before I leave this parable, I have another remark to make on the strange inconsistency, into which Mr. Gipps fell, in his anxiety to make out his anti-millenarian scheme. The wheat and tares, which according to him are all the godly, and all the ungodly of all ages, remain unsevered till the end of the age; yet in describing *the separate state*, in order to mark the distinction between the resurrection of the just and the unjust,

he speaks of the great mass of both, (and justly,) as having previously been severed, the just being with Christ, the unjust being in wretchedness; but the parable knows nothing of any, save those who remain unsevered up to that period. It cannot therefore, mean to describe those who have gone down to the regions of the dead.

THE DRAW NET.

This parable has been similarly misapprehended. The notion of a resurrection is here again assumed. All that we are taught is, that, at the *consummation of the age*, there will a separation of the wicked from among the just. The good fish having been gathered into vessels, as into a place of security, the bad, heaped indiscriminately together, without any redeeming admixture, are cast away. It was thus also, in the case of the tares, they too were first collected into bundles, *preparatory* to the burning, while the wheat is safely housed in the barn. Is not all this the very counterpart of what the prophet taught of old? Having promised to labouring Judah, the resurrection of her faithful progenitors now sleeping in the dust, who shall awake and sing, their dew being as the very dew of the dawn, seeing the land shall then cast out her *Rephaim*, (giants) he immediately addresses the living just of Judah. "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were, for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity, the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain. In that day, the LORD, with his sore, and great, and strong sword shall punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, (Antichrist) even Leviathan that crooked serpent, and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea." (Egypt, the king of the South.) Isa. xxvi. 19—21; xxvii. 1. Now mark what follows, the responsive song of the vineyard is sung **IN THAT DAY**, v. 2.—which is thus closed by Jehovah, "they that come of the root of Jacob shall flourish: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit," v. 6.—*the defenced city* shall be desolated, and left as a wilderness, v. 10. "And it shall come to pass, **IN THAT DAY**, that the LORD shall make a gathering of his fruit from the channel of the river, unto the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gleaned up one by one, O ye children of Israel, not for faggots of burning, but for blessing," v. 12. Furthermore, "it shall come to pass **IN THAT DAY**, that the great Trumpet, (that of Jubilee) shall be blown, and they shall come, which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship

the LORD IN THE HOLY MOUNT, AT JERUSALEM," v. 13. Thus, then there will be a resurrection, like the dew of the dawn, at what time, Jehovah, safe housing his people, shall punish the inhabitants of the earth, leagued with Leviathan; mercy shall then be vouchsafed to Israel—her children shall be gathered out of all nations, according to that which was before promised, Deut. xxx. 4, and her outcasts shall come from Assyria and Egypt, to worship Jehovah in *Jerusalem*.

Mr. Gipps here again assumes that the *Angeli* are those, whom we commonly call angels. I wish this word were always rendered messengers—it would often prevent misapprehension—I am convinced that these messengers are the saints, with whom the Lord my God shall come, the white robed warriors on white horses, who follow the Word of God, when he goeth forth to the slaughter of his enemies. Rev. xix. 14. Again he assumes that the casting of the wicked into the furnace of fire, is the same event with "the casting into the lake of fire" of all who "are not written in the book of life." Rev. xx. 15. But as those, who are there described as being cast into the lake of fire, are the risen dead, and those who are drawn to shore in the draw net, must be those, who are living at the *consummation of the age*, for two reasons, presently to be noticed; I argue that the casting of the wicked into the furnace of fire, as described in the parable, must be the same with the casting alive of the beast and the false prophet, against whom, the word of God goeth forth to war, into the lake of fire, burning with brimstone. Rev. xix. 20. *One* reason, which leads me to conclude, that the captured fish represent the living at the period specified, is, that they remain unsevered till that period, whereas, the dead in going down to Hades, are actually severed upon their entrance into the invisible world. A *second* reason, which operates with me, in arriving at this conviction, is, that the fish are not represented as having been dead, and then restored to life, but, on the contrary, as being all brought alive out of their natural element, to the shore; and as having been drawn in thither, not by any murderous mode of capture, which might of itself, deprive of life, but by a net, which injureth not, and which is constantly employed, in order to remove fish, in an unharmed state, from one sheet or stream of water, to another.

THE MARRIAGE SUPPER. Mat. xxii. 1, 14.

In Mr. Gipps' remarks on the close of this parable, we meet with many unfounded assumptions, which are essential to his system of interpretation. 1.—He assumes it to be the Bridegroom who comes in to see the guests, v. 11, but of the bride-

groom no mention is made throughout the parable, except in the second verse. "The kingdom of Heaven is like unto a king, which made a marriage for his Son." The Son was the Bridegroom, but of the actual appearance of the Son at the feast, no account is given. It was the king, and not the Son, who made this preparatory survey of the guests, and corresponds with Dan. vii. 9. 2.—He assumes, that the man without the wedding garment is the representative of all mere nominal professors, who have not put on Christ, of all ages, who have succeeded in deceiving the servants (*δουλούς*) of Christ, or his ministers, and who must therefore be raised, in order to be judged. It might be enough to say in the phrase of the Scottish law, "not proven," but we have abundant evidence from the parable itself, that this unmeetly garmented man is not the representative of the dead. The king had provided the marriage feast, (*γάμος*) the nuptial festivity, as evidenced on the Mount of Transfiguration, for his Son, and therefore, sent he forth his servants, John possibly and his disciples, to summon the Jews—a refusal follows—and other servants, the 70 disciples and the apostles, renew the summons, which being in like manner unheeded, (while the messengers themselves, are either persecuted or slain) Jerusalem, the city of the murderers, is destroyed and burned with fire. I observe, that had the invitation been accepted by the Jews, had they abandoned the habiliments of worldliness and hypocrisy, had they at once adorned themselves in fitting raiment for the august solemnity, the marriage,—the solemnization of which, was strictly dependant on the alternative of man's evil,—had then taken place. But not seeing the glory of the bridegroom, nor the feast actually prepared, they discredited the message, and involved themselves in those national calamities, which have ever since rested upon their devoted posterity. The portion of the parable, which we have thus examined, all relateth to men of Abraham's lineage, in proper flesh and blood, dwelling on earth's surface, and meeting with retribution in this life. Without the slightest intimation of any change of scene, we are next presented with the mission of the servants to the highways, not of Hades assuredly, but of the Gentile world. They succeed in collecting a great number, *good and bad*, on whose pretensions they decide not, between whom they make no separation, and all of whom profess abundant readiness to become guests. These assuredly are neither disembodied spirits, nor men raised from the dead, but men like unto the Jews, collected by mortal servants, similar to those servants (*δουλοῖς*), who were persecuted unto the death, by the Jews. Just at this juncture, when the servants have accomplished their mission, in the assembling of

a large company, out of all the highways, the king takes his survey, not of the feast, for it is not yet spread forth to view, though all the preparations for it, have long previously been made, but of those men who have avowed their willingness to partake of the entertainment. His eye immediately discerns one, who is without the nuptial robe, who has ventured to associate himself with the guests in his own raiment of worldliness and hypocrisy, just like Ananias and Saphira. His rejection follows. Now if the murderers, whose city was burned, were mortal men—if the places they scornfully vacated, were reserved for others, mortal like themselves, (see Matt. xvi. 43.) we are accordingly summoned to supply their room—if the servants who deliver the summons, and those who professedly accept it are all mortal—if the mortal servants who summon them, can only gather them together in some place where mortal men can be gathered, then does it follow that the ill arrayed intruder is also mortal, seeing he has taken his station in the place where the servants have gathered all the company, v. 10. The assembly you will observe, are not brought in by supernal agents before the king, that he may pass judgment upon their pretensions, but he himself unexpectedly comes in to take this view of them. 3.—Mr. Gipps next assumes that the servants (*διδασκάλους*) the *deacons*, who are commanded to exclude the presumptuous unprovided guests, are the angel-executioners of the judgment. In this I consider him to be mistaken. As the assembly which is viewed, is the church in its militant state, collected together by one class of servants, (the *δουλοὶ*); so I believe the Deacons here, to be another class of ecclesiastical office-bearers, who at the time of the end, being filled with the Holy Ghost, and endowed with supernatural discernment, shall, by express revelation from the Lord, cast out the evil person or persons, (for he is doubtless, the representative of a class of persons,) from communion. 4.—He assumes that the *outer darkness* is the same with the *lake of fire*. Two things more dissimilar than *outer darkness* and the *lake of fire*, cannot well be conceived. If the view I have given above of this most important prediction be correct, then the *outer darkness* must be that, which is outside of the church, even that, wherein the votaries of Antichrist shall be involved. Now it is not a little remarkable, that it is said of the man of sin, that he shall deceive all those who have not received the *love* of the truth, that they might be saved, while it is added that “God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie; that they ALL might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” 2 Thess. 10—12. Still the ejection of an outward communicant into this *outer darkness*

would not *necessarily* involve his final perdition, any more than the disasters, which fell upon Judah necessarily involved, the damnation of all the Jews, whom the Romans slew or dispersed. It might, and doubtless would, in some cases, amount to no more than the act of judicial mercy under similar circumstances, commanded (1 Cor. v. 5.) to be exercised. In either case it conveys a most solemn warning to us, on whom the ends of the world are come, seeing we live on the eve of that survey, which Jehovah shall thus take of his church, and who may, notwithstanding our high sounding profession, be consigned to weeping and gnashing of teeth. If found finally in this condition, our situation shall be fearful indeed, according as it is written in that remarkable parallel passage Zeph. i. 7, which, with its context, sheds immense light upon the subject. "The LORD hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath bid his guests. And it shall come to pass in the day of the Lord's sacrifice that I will punish the princes, and the king's children, and all such as are clothed with *strange apparel*." "The evil *servants* shall, in that day, be punished as well as the princes," v. 9. "A cry and a howling shall be heard from the gates, and a crashing from the hills," v. 10. "Jerusalem shall be searched with candles," v. 12. "The great day of the Lord is near, near, and hasteth greatly: the voice of the day of the Lord: the mighty man shall *cry there bitterly*—that day is a day of wrath, *a day of trouble and distress*, a day of wasteness and desolation, *a day of darkness and gloominess*, a day of clouds and *thick darkness*," v. 14, 15. "And I will bring distress upon men and they shall walk like blind men because they have sinned against the Lord," &c. I need not refer to the points of resemblance—I only observe that these things are said concerning the situation of society on this earth immediately preceding the last tremendous crisis. 5.—Mr. Gipps further assumes that the parable represents the time of Christ's second coming *with his spouse the church*. This I regard as the most extraordinary assumption of all. We have before seen that the bridegroom is not noticed—neither is the bride. We have only the guests described.—The bride is not even by implication alluded to.

THE TALENTS.—Matt. xxv. 14.

In his exposition of this parable we meet just the same kind of assumptions on the part of Mr. Gipps. 1.—He assumes the resurrection of all parties who are reckoned with—though not a syllable is to be met with throughout it concerning the resurrection of any.—It is the visible church alone that is here described as reckoned with—(all the dead, small and great, are not summoned before him). The members of his church,

symbolized by his own servants, are solemnly called to account for the use they made of his goods during his absence—the faithful are appointed to offices of trust and government over the cities of the world, (we know of no cities beyond it,) suited to their characters, proportioned to their abilities, and corresponding with their past employment of the means of usefulness they enjoyed. Their *appointment* to these offices and *not their actual entrance upon them* is all that is here described. The recompense of the reward is the subject of the narrative. One alone, who wrapped up his Lord's talent in a napkin, is deprived of all share in the joy of his Lord. 2.—This servant is assumed, as in the case of the man without the wedding garment, to be the representative of all the ungodly of all ages. But when we consider that, even within the limits of the Church, many are called but few chosen, it seems strange that the many should here stand represented as being only *one* to *four*. But thus it will be at the sifting time. The nominal professors will drop off in the time of persecution and reproach, when they have no longer any temporal advantage to gain, while the solitary unprofitable servant, who refused to exercise his gift, though he remained in connection with the body, shall be himself cut off from all privileges and recompense by the direct exercise of his Lord's power. 3.—His expulsion from the body, his jactation into the outer darkness is assumed, as in the former case, to denote the same thing as the casting of all the ungodly into the lake of fire. We need not repeat what we have said before on this point.

There is one remark I must add before I leave this parable. The Lord coming to *reckon* with his servants is a different thing from the Lord coming to *reign* with them. When they *enter into his joy* they shall, indeed, reign with him, but the scrutiny which takes place here is preparatory to it. I would make this parable synchronize with the sealing of the 144,000 in Revelations vii. 4. xiv. 1, who then receive their appointment to office, when they are sealed.

JUDGMENT OF THE SHEEP AND GOATS.—Matt. xxv. 31—46.

This prediction is one of immense importance. The time to which it relates is the time, in which the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him. To understand the parable aright it is material to ascertain from the light of the other Scriptures what the coming of the Son of Man in his glory denoteth; for the language of Christ here is not descriptive of the epoch itself, but only of an event connected with it, and the terms actually employed suppose that the character of that epoch was well understood, as an admit-

ted matter of faith by his auditors. Now, I find this epoch marked with the greatest particularity by Daniel vii. 13, 14, where, having previously described the origin, progress, and fatal end of the four great Monarchies, and of the Gentile apostacy, he says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of Heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."—From which I gather, that when he comes in his glory he shall succeed to universal sovereignty, obtain the greatness of the empire forfeited by the Beasts, and never lose it like them by forfeiture. *Peoples, nations, and languages* are made subservient to him, and are made so then for the first time. The subdivisions of mankind here described must exist in order to own him king, but those subdivisions are peculiar to a terrestrial condition, and it is, therefore, men as inhabiting the world, who shall then become his subjects. It is under these very terms Nebuchadnezzar and Darius respectively address their subjects, inscribing their decrees *to all peoples, nations and languages*. Dan. iii. 4; vi. 25. It is the invariable formula employed through this prophet to characterize the dwellers upon earth, who were subject to imperial rule. When, therefore, it is written that they shall be transferred from the rulers who abused their authority, to Messiah himself, it is tantamount to the prediction elsewhere met with, that he shall be king over all the earth. But further, this shall come to pass, when he shall *come in the clouds of heaven*, which is equivalent with the expression in the parable before us, *when the Son of Man shall come in his glory*. When he cometh in glory all men therefore cannot have put off mortality, nor shall they stand before him in resurrection bodies, but the generation of men then existing, who shall survive the tribulation of those days, shall continue to inhabit the earth, not as the vassals of earthly monarchs, but as the liege subjects of the Son of Man. I need not at present multiply proofs from the Prophets, that when he cometh in glory he will come in the character here foretold, and just at that epoch when the possessors of abused power shall be compelled to relinquish it to him.

But in addition to the epoch it is material also to ascertain who those are that shall accompany him; who, in fact, are meant by **ALL THE HOLY MESSENGERS**, spoken of here. In Enoch's prophecy they are represented to be *the Myriads of his Saints*. Jude 14. Paul writes that those, who are to be brought

with him, are they who have previously slept with him, *the dead in Christ*, to whom are to be conjoined the believing quick. 1 Thess. iv. 14—17. And again, that *the messengers of HIS OWN power* (αγγελων δυναμεως αυτου) who were once troubled and afflicted for his sake, shall be the attendants of his Apocalypse from Heaven. 2 Thess. i. 7. They are said to be *his own* messengers, *ARTOR*, in contradistinction to those of the Father, who are commonly described by the term *angels*. It is important to bear this in mind.—When in the latter day his feet shall stand upon the Mount of *Olives*, it is written, Zech. xiv. 5, that *all the saints* shall come with him, but I know no Scripture authority for stating that *all the angels*, strictly so called, shall come with him. The saints are *his own messengers*. Thus in the parable of the Tares, it is indefinitely asserted, Matt. xiii. 39, *the reapers are messengers*; but in verse 41, the indefinite assertion assumes a distinct and definite form. *The Son of man shall send forth HIS OWN MESSENGERS*, τους αγγελους αυτου, *and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend*. He tells us himself, indeed, that “he shall send his own angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect (by whom I understand the Jews,) from the four winds,” &c. Matt. xxiv. 31, but these trumpets of the great Jubilee will, I believe, be blown by the saints. It may be necessary to notice the statement, *Hereafter ye shall see the heaven open and the angels of God*, as in Jacob’s vision, *ascending and descending upon the Son of Man*, executing his behests and fulfilling his righteous pleasure. As his own messengers are called elsewhere the *saints of the Most High*, so here they are called the *Messengers of God*, descending from the New Jerusalem to their camp contiguous to the *terrestrial city*, Rev. xx. 9, before the heavenly city descends actually to the earth, Rev. xxi. 10, 24, 27, when earth shall become a fit site for its abiding resting-place. But to refer to the Prophet Daniel, the angel who interpreted to him the vision of the four Beasts, and of the righteous empire, by which they are to be uprooted and succeeded, adds, in explanation of this latter empire, and as corresponding with the cession of empire to the Son of Man, *But the Saints of the Most High or of the high places* (marg. & com. Eph. i. 3; ii. 6) *shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom even for ever and ever*. Here then we have the Saints as the *supernal rulers* taking the empire out of the grasp of the Beast, and entering on the possession of it themselves, at the very time when the Son of Man cometh in glory, and receiveth his own indestructible and universal kingdom from the Ancient of days. But this they could not do unless they accompanied and received it conjointly with him, unless, in fact, the cession of it to him implied the cession of it to them.

And this it does for they are *joint-heirs* along with him, and shall be glorified together with him. Rom. viii. 17. He shall grant it to them to sit with him on *his* throne, even as *he* sat down on the Father's throne. Rev. iii. 21. He has made them kings and priests unto God, and they shall reign with him on the earth, Rev. v. 10. But Daniel proceeds afterwards himself to expatiate further on his own vision, thus interpreted, "I beheld, and the same horn made war *with the saints*, and prevailed against them; until the ancient of days came, and *judgment* was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the Saints possessed the Kingdom," v. 21, 22. From this I gather that the Saints were the objects of a successful persecution up to the session of the ancient of days; that they were therefore once the faithful confessors of Messiah; and must thence be the faithful in Christ Jesus. Again, I learn, that they are not themselves arraigned before the tribunal of Jesus, but are advanced to judicial eminence, and regal power—they must therefore be *all the Saints (αγιοι) the messengers (αγγελου)* who shall be with the Son of Man when he cometh in his glory, and when ALL NATIONS are gathered before him.

By the expressions *all nations* Mr. Gipps understands all the generations of men, godly and ungodly, from the foundation of the world, up to this time. They cannot be the departed generations of the godly, because they are included in *all the holy messengers*, who accompany Messiah, and before whom these nations are gathered. They cannot be the departed generations of the ungodly, for there is no note whatever of their having been raised from the grave, no mention of the dead, small and great, standing before the great white throne. But as we have a long argument to prove that the word *nations* really does denote the risen dead of all generations, we must endeavour to examine it—"First," he says, "the usual signification of the word *nations* or *all nations*, implies persons not of one generation only, but of various generations." Well, it is quite true that when the history, civilization, or character of nations are the subject of discourse, the various generations of men, who as compatriots have figured on the stage, or swelled the population for the day, either are or may be included; but it is only in reference to them as the once mortal occupants of the soil, who did in their time perform their part in the exhibition of the national character and prowess, but not as disembodied spirits, or as men raised from the dead. It is with reference to the past and to society, and not with reference to individual conduct or to their future condition, that allusion is made when the bye-gone generations of men are spoken of

under the general appellation of the nation or nations to which they belonged. But Scripture usage must determine the sense in which the term is employed by inspiration. I take Mr. Gipps' references—*I have made thee a Father of many nations*, Rom. iv. 17. This promise is to be regarded in the light of anticipatory history. Many nations did spring from Abraham in the respective lines of Ishmael, Isaac, and the sons of Keturah, together with all the seed to whom the promise is sure, so that he is "the father of us all (*κατεργαυτι*) in the sight of God, who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things, which be not, as though they were." v. 16, 17. But how does this affect the question—does the descent of *nations*, literally inhabiting the world and distinguished by their respective *national* features, though those nations descend from Abraham, at all justify the idea that the nations can be expressive of the *dead small and great*? Is it in their corporate capacity, or as characterized by their national distinctions they are to stand before *the great white throne*? Paul proves God's purpose of mercy to the Gentiles, by referring to sundry prophecies, which speak of a time yet future, in which all nations shall rejoice in God, praise his name, and be ruled over by the root of Jesse, Rom. xv. 9—12; but unless it be proved, that this is to take place after the supposed dissolution of the entire fabric of the world, I see not how the argument is improved by this reference. Such a proof indeed I know cannot be given, for when I look back to the last quotation made by the apostle from Isa. x. 10, where he found it, I find it added that *it shall come to pass in THAT day*, when the Gentiles shall thus trust in Jesse's root, "that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people that shall be left from Assyria, &c. gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth—remove the envy between her and Ephraim—cause them to spoil the Philistines, Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites,—divide Euphrates into seven streams, and reserve a highway from Assyria, as of old, from Egypt for his people." vi. ii. 16. All these things can only be done on the present surface of our world; and the nations therefore, who are to trust in Jesse's root, must be literal nations in flesh and blood embodied.—But to proceed, it is written, "the Scripture foreseeing God would justify the nations through faith preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed," Gal. iii. 8, and so all nations shall—for his seed shall possess the gate of his enemies, and be thus empowered to bless them, Gen. xxii. 17. "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit. From this ultimate purpose of the Lord the apostle gathers the argument,

that as all nations are to be then blessed, believing Gentiles are now also, by an inchoate fulfilment of the prediction, blessed with faithful Abraham, v. 9. But is it not of the present justification of the mystic seed of Abraham taken out of the nations and constituted a *chosen nation*, a *royal priesthood*, a *peculiar people* that Paul speaketh? and is it not of the ultimate condition of the earth, still distinguished by national subdivisions, once inimical to, but now possessed by Israel that the promise, which he quotes, speaketh? The song of the redeemed, next referred to, Rev. v. 9, is the song of those, who have ceased to have any thing national about them, for they are redeemed *out of* all nations. They do not form now, though they once belonged to separate nations.—Again, Rev. xii. 5. The man child is “to rule all nations with a rod of iron.” Surely this prediction comporteth not with one view entertained by our respected author—whether it be the literal or the mystic Christ, who is spoken of, all nations shall thus be ruled by him—according as we have seen predicted in Dan. vii. or as in these very words it is more particularly foretold concerning him, Ps. ii. 9; Rev. ii. 27; xix. 15. But the “all nations” to be thus ruled are the nations of this world, subdivided, in like manner, as we see them subdivided now, and consisting of men clothed in real flesh and blood. Of this there can be no doubt, if, as it is stated in the second Psalm, he who shall thus rule them, is to sit the while as king on the *holy hill of Zion*, to obtain “the Heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession,” v. 6—9. The cause of Babylon’s fall is traced, Rev. xiv. 8, to her having “made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” If she made the disembodied spirits do so, there would be some ground for her arrogant claim to the keys of hell. The nations she scourged, who partook of her wine, and of her fornication, were the nations who submitted to her supremacy and domination. The last reference trenches on particularly debateable ground.—Satan shall be bound in order that he may not deceive the *nations* during the thousand years, Rev. xx. 3. Let the interpretation of this contested place be what it may, it is on all sides acknowledged that the nations, who are thus to be exempted from temptations, are nations of living men, who never passed through death.—The point, however, seems to be in all these passages, which have been adduced, that, though they be nations of living men, they are designed to describe more generations of living men than one—and what results from this? nothing.—No period can be referred to in any one nation, wherein there was not a constant succession of living persons taking place—the young ever pressing on the

old, and the cradle ever supplying the ranks, which the grave had thinned. But in no one instance is the term employed to describe those, who having been gathered to their fathers, have gone down into the region of invisible spirits. The distinction of nations existeth not there, and indeed is utterly impossible. The separation in that world not being according to nations, but according to character. They are not re-collected there as Britons and as Hindoos, but classified alone as the just and the unjust. In opposition however, to this remark, Mr. Gipps adds "*secondly*, The term *nations* in Rev. vii. 9, appears to me to refer, not only to persons of different generations, but to those who have died before Christ's second coming, in agreement with the obvious meaning of the term, Matt. xxv." That it is so obvious, then, is the question at issue. Now the place he refers to is the verse immediately following the account of the sealing of the *twelve tribes of Israel*, and to the following effect—"After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of (~~an~~ *out of*) all nations, (out of every nation) and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands." Now, the very same word, *out of*, which is employed in the passage already examined, Rev. v. 9, is the very same, which is used here; and though it be translated in our version as the mere sign of the genitive case, I can see nothing which distinguishes it in the smallest degree from the parallel place, where the phrase, with which it is connected, is not surmised to signify, "those who have died before Christ's second coming." I am willing to admit, indeed, that the countless multitude standing before the throne is composed of such, but are they described as *nations*?—No such thing. They are composed of persons *out of* all (every) nations. And why this reference to their former estate on earth, but to teach us that, besides the 144,000 sealed of Israel, there will be in that same day of sealing, a goodly company of Gentile origin also, who shall act the part of faithful witnesses for Jesus? "Thirdly," Mr. Gipps continues, "the context shews that the term *all nations* cannot refer only to the generation then living, but must also include preceding generations. For *the sheep* who form one division of all nations, (ver. 32,) represent the Saints, but the Saints not only of *that* but also of all preceding generations will be with the Lord when he comes. 1 Thess. iv. 15—17; Col. iii. 4. Consequently *the sheep* include the saints of all preceding generations, and therefore the term *all nations* also includes all preceding generations," &c. Now, I deny that the sheep do represent the saints strictly so called. If I be correct, in what I have already endeavoured to establish, that the Saints are the

holy messengers, who accompany Messiah, then is it impossible that they can be the sheep also. The one surround Messiah, as assessors on his throne; the others are gathered before him to be judged. The nations judicially assembled are separated and distinguished by the characteristic appellatives of *goats* and *sheep*. I ask then is there no nation, which Scripture delights to represent under the interesting symbol of sheep? Assuredly the Jews are emphatically the sheep of the Lord's pasture. When Judah is to obtain victory over Greece's sons, it is written—"the *Lord* their God shall save them in that day, as the flock of his people." Zach. ix. 16. I might refer to innumerable places to this effect, but I satisfy myself with the notice of Ezek. xxxiv. 10—31. The Lord having declared his purpose of requiring his flock at the hands of the political shepherds, who scattered Israel, promises himself to search and seek them out; to gather his SHEEP from the places of their dispersion, in the cloudy and dark day; to feed them in a good pasture; to provide them with a good fold and fat pasture on the high mountains of Israel; to seek the lost, bind the broken, strengthen the sick, take care of the *fat and the strong, and feed them with discretion.† He then proceeds to declare his purpose of judgment, in an address to his own flock. (ver. 17, see marg.) *And you, O my flock, thus saith the LORD GOD, behold I judge between*

The small cattle of LAMBS AND KIDS,

And between the RAMS *and the great* HE GOATS. This is I know is generally understood to refer to the two divisions of Judah, the righteous, and unrighteous. But in the preceding description of the flock we meet with no notice of kids or He-goats. It is the *sheep* alone, that Jehovah speaks of as his flock, which he is to gather and feed. And having gathered these on the mountains of Israel, he resolves to decide judicially between them and the *goats*, who can therefore be no other than the Gentile Anti-Christian confederates, including indeed the apostate Jews, who shall be in alliance with them, and against whom, as we know from other Scriptures, their arms shall finally be turned. He now addresses the goats—"Is it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? And to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet?" *And as for my flock*, which is contradistinguished from the party addressed, "they eat that, which ye have trodden with your feet, and they drink that, which ye have fouled with your feet." This ungenerous treatment of the sheep, want of affection towards them, and indisposition to

* v. 16, so Arab. Syr. Vulg. Newcombe.

† Newcombe.

serve them, is made the very ground of the judgment. "Therefore thus saith the LORD GOD unto them: Behold I, even I will judge, between the fat cattle and the lean cattle." v. 20. The fat cattle here are commonly confounded with the fat and the strong of Jehovah's own flock, of whom he promises to take care in v. 17. But the characteristic of fatness is insufficient to prove the identity. Some of his own flock may be fat in comparison of others, but, as an aggregate, his own flock, as contrasted with the goats, who have eaten up the good pasture and trodden down the residue, may be lean. That they are not the fat of his own flock, who are here spoken of, appears from what follows. "Because ye have thrust with side and with shoulder, and pushed all the diseased with your horns, (the horns or powers of the Gentiles) TILL HE HAVE SCATTERED THEM ABROAD; therefore will I save my flock, and they shall be no more a prey; and I will judge between cattle and cattle." v. 21, 22. The Jews did not disperse the Jews. The Gentiles *scattered them abroad*. His flock, the Jews, are to be saved from the scatterers—"And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd," in the room of the political shepherds or rulers, from whose power they are rescued. In other words, as in v. 24, "I the Jehovah will be their Elohim, and my servant David A PRINCE among them; I the LORD have spoken it." I reserve the rest of this prediction till the close of our remarks on the Saviour's prophecy. I observe we have here Messiah the Prince, David, the beloved one, succeeding to the office of the evil Shepherds, the Princes of the Gentiles; and the nations themselves, as *goats* judged. Is there not, therefore, a perfect correspondence between this prediction and the account given in Matthew of the nations gathered before the Son of Man, and separated for judgment, the SHEEP and the GOATS? I cannot but believe, that both predictions relate to the same period and the same parties. To use Mr. Gipps' mode of argument, and indeed his very words, changing only the final reference, "the very striking coincidence, which there is between the description in Matt. xxv. 31 to 46, of the events, which will take place at the time of Christ's coming in glory, and the description which the Holy Ghost has also given us in" Ezek. xxxiv. 10—31, "of the events which will take place at the time" when Israel is rescued from evil Shepherds, and placed under the shepherding of Messiah the Prince, "proves, I conceive, that they are one and the same event." But to proceed—the sheep are addressed as the *Blessed of the Father*, and called to *inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world*. This address would

assuredly be applicable to the case of the Saints, because they are the blessed of the Father and a kingdom is prepared for them, from the foundation of the world, and were they the parties symbolised by the sheep, no doubt could exist that it was their blessedness and their kingdom that was spoken of. But the natural posterity of Abraham are also *blessed*, and a kingdom is also in reserve at the very same epoch, for them. Hear what is written.—*In that day*, when the mountain of the house of the Lord is exalted above the hills, and many nations come there to be taught of his ways by the Lord, and universal peace prevails, “in that day, saith the LORD, will I assemble her that **HALTETH**, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast off a strong nation; and **JEHOVAH** shall reign over them in Mount Zion, from henceforth even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, **UNTO THEE SHALL IT COME, EVEN THE FIRST DOMINION; THE KINGDOM SHALL COME TO THE DAUGHTER OF JERUSALEM**, Micah iv. 6, 8. Now Imperial authority is here assigned to Judah, and yet she herself is placed under the more immediate government of Messiah; while she is by two special notes identified with the sheep: *first*, by the expression *she that halted*, in allusion to lame sheep who go sideways; and *secondly*, by the name conferred on her, *the tower of the flock*. The decision of the Son of Man, rests precisely on the same grounds with the decision in Ezekiel. The *goats* are brought in guilty thus, “inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, (the Jews emphatically are the brethren of the Lord Jesus, for he was of the seed of Abraham and of the family of David, according to the flesh,) *ye did it not to me*; and the *sheep* are accepted in these terms, “inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” The goats are judged in Ezekiel, because so far from shewing kindness to the sheep, they scattered and peeled them, eat their good pastures, and fouled their good waters. So here, it is the conduct, that was observed *towards the sheep*, that is made the criterion of judgment. I feel perfectly satisfied, notwithstanding the ingenuity of Mr. Gipps, and indeed of the commentators in general, that this is not the criterion of judgment before the white throne, but works in general. So long ago as the call of Abraham it was made the criterion of the divine dealings towards mankind. “I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.” Gen. xii. 3. I therefore look with gladsome approval on the contemplated emancipation of the Jews by the British Legislature. They talk indeed of the course, that ought to be pursued by a Christian nation, towards

the blasphemers of Messiah. There never has been in the strict and proper sense, a Christian nation—there is not at this moment a Christian nation—and there never will be a Christian nation upon earth, till Messiah shall take his station on the throne of his Father David. Shew me any one nation, at any one time, of which the majority either have been or are Christians in deed and in truth. But we must not wander from the question. We now arrive at the sentence, which passes on the respective parties, the sheep and the goats. The latter are consigned to death or punishment. This corresponds with the punishment inflicted on the slain of all flesh, whose carcasses are an abhorrence, and whose torments are conspicuous to the survivors, Isa. lxvi. 24; with the slaying of the Beast, the destruction of his body, and its consignment to the flames, Dan. vii. 11; with the harvest and vintage in the valley of Jehoshaphat, Joel iii. 14; with the supernatural destruction, one after another, of the inlets of sin, the bodily organs of those, who fought against Jerusalem, Zech. xiv. 12; with the conflagration of those, who do wickedly, as stubble in an oven, Mal. iv. 1; and with the treading of the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, the supper provided for the fowls of heaven, and the consigning of the Beast, the False Prophet, and their deluded votaries, to the lake of fire burning with brimstone, Rev. xix. 17—21. The reward bestowed on the sheep *seems* to present more difficulty, but there is none in reality. The Jewish nation, as collected before the Son of man, will at this crisis be *righteous*. Pleased with, as of old time, in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, the rebels having previously been purged out, the restored residue shall, with true penitence, remember their doings, and their *sweet savour* shall be accepted, Ezek. xx. 33—44. The surviving third part of the self-restored portion, found in the occupation of the land, refined as silver and gold in the fire, shall call on the name of the Lord and be heard: “I will say, it is my people, and they shall say the Lord is my God.” Zech. xiii. 9. When they confess their iniquities; when their uncircumcised hearts are humbled; and they have accepted the punishment of their iniquities, it is then the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall be remembered, and the land also. Lev. xxvi. 30—45. (see Horsey in loco.) “When from thence thou shalt seek the *Lord* thy God and shalt find him, and when thou shalt seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul in thy affliction, and when all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, then thou shalt turn to the *Lord* thy God, and shalt be obedient to his voice, (for the *Lord* thy God is a merciful God) he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy

fathers, which he swore unto them." Deut. iv. 28—31. (amended after Horseley); see also Deut. xxx. 1—7. Fearful abominations we know will be committed, by the apostate Jews in Jerusalem, as described in Ezek. viii. but before swift destruction cometh upon the offenders, the LORD says, "Go through the midst of the City, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof." Ezek. ix. 4. These correspond with the third refined part in Zechariah, and with those mentioned by the same prophet, on whom the spirit of grace and of supplication being poured out, they mourn, like the mourning for an only son, each family apart, when they look upon him, whom they have pierced, Zech. xii. 10—14. But still more evidently does the description of those mourners in Jerusalem correspond with the 144,000 of Israel, who are sealed, before judgment is suffered to alight on the ungodly. Rev. vii. 1—4. Now, I find in an express, undeniable, and universally admitted description of the second advent, these righteous mourners specifically mentioned as beholding, at the same time with all nations, the Son of Man in his glory—"Behold, he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him: and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Rev. i. 7. The reference is undeniably to Zechariah, and the parties described are the inhabitants of the world, not of Hades, *every eye*, divided into the two classes of sheep and goats—*they who pierced him*, the Jews—*all the kindreds of the earth*, the Gentiles. This might be proved from innumerable scriptures to be their lot, but I confine myself to the context in Ezekiel xxxiv. which I reserved till now. Placed under the happy rule of Messiah their Shepherd all this blessedness is their's. "I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land; and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness, (for it now becomes a portion of the land, according to the promise, that it should extend from Euphrates to the Nile) and sleep in the woods. And I will make them and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season; *there shall be showers of blessing;*" v. 25, 26—extraordinary fertility shall succeed to barrenness, safety to peril, and liberty to bondage; ver. 27, 28. "And I will raise up for them *a plant of renown*, and they shall no more be consumed with hunger in the land, neither bear the shame of the heathen any more. Thus shall they know that I the *Jehovah* their Elohim *am with them* (Immanuel,) and that they, even *the house of Israel*, are my people, saith the *Lord God*. And *ye my flock*, the flock of my pasture are *Men*, and

I am your God, saith the *Lord God*.” I content myself with the quotation. I have now brought this long examination of the Parable of the Judgment on the Nations to a close, and if I have satisfied you as to its true meaning, I have, at the same time, overturned all the inferences, which from a mistaken apprehension of its subject, were deduced from it by Mr. Gipps. The ordinary view of it remained with me for a long period after I had received, (now upwards of twenty years ago,) the doctrine of the personal reign of Jesus and his Saints on earth. I therefore wonder not at the error of this respected author. The colour, which our educational prepossessions cast over a great portion of God’s word, both obscures a vast mass of the truth it contains, and prevents its reception. This is more particularly the case with the Parables. They have been so thoroughly interwoven with the traditions of men, it is difficult to distinguish them from the foreign threads, which have been passed through them.

But independently of this difficulty in the way of a right interpretation, there is another cause, though it has greatly been overlooked, which adds largely to the prevailing ignorance of their contents—the designed obscurity, in which they are involved. Those, who are least friendly to prophetic enquiry, imagining that the parables are amongst the plainest parts of Scripture, though such of them as are allegorical are one and all prophetic, consider the veriest tyro in divinity capable of expounding them. But hear what the Holy One, who spake them, saith; “Unto you it is given to know the Mystery of the Kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see, and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.” Mark iv. 11, 12. “All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them; that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things, which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.” Matt. xiii. 34, 35. With these remarks I conclude my review of Mr. Gipps’ appeal to the Parables, but as his *second* chapter is far from being confined to this branch of the subject, I shall find abundant materials there to supply me with matter for another letter.

LETTER III.

The TRANSFIGURATION—The Coming-One—2 Pet. i. 16—Prophecy of the Judgment, Matt. xxiv.—Parable of the Fig-tree, and all the trees, Luke xxi.—The Gospel Kingdom—Figurative Comings—The Last Day—Christ's voice heard in the grave—The Judgment-seat of Christ—Retribution of Enemies.

I now return to that portion of Mr. Gipps' second letter, which does not refer to the Parables. I commence with his notice of

THE TRANSFIGURATION.—Matt. xvi. 27.

To this reference I would add verse 28, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his own (*αυτου*) father, with his own messengers, (*αγγελων αυτου*) and then he shall reward each according to his practice. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his own (*αυτου*) kingdom."

The parties at this period, to be recompensed, I believe to be *his own messengers*. If you have gone along with me, in the remarks I have already made, you will agree with me in deciding that *his own* messengers are the saints, with whom the Son of Man shall come, when he shall take possession of his kingdom; the rewards, which he here refers to, will be also admitted to be those, which it is his gracious purpose to confer upon them, in correspondence with the rule laid down in the parable of the Talents. But the passage before us opens with a note of reference to an antecedent statement; that note is the word "*for*." It is taken by Mr. Gipps as introducing the alleged proof, that as each will be rewarded according to his practice, *that* man will be profited nothing, who, though he had gained the whole world, shall then lose his own soul. I believe him to misapprehend the argument. Christ would enforce the advantage of taking up our cross and following him. He does this in two ways, *first*, by shewing that he, who acts otherwise, shall lose his own soul, and *secondly*, by showing that he, who adopts this course, for his sake, shall find it. This latter he establishes, and, in establishing it, establishes the other by inference, by saying, that when he comes in the glory of his Father, he shall bring with him his own messengers, those who denied themselves, took up their cross and followed him, and give a reward to each of them, that is to each messenger,

according to their service done for him, as his messengers. In order to prove his own theory, it was quite necessary for Mr. Gipps to shew, that the coming of the Son of Man *in the glory of his Father*, in ver. 27, was a widely different thing from the *Son of Man coming in his kingdom*, ver. 28. This he has attempted to do by a violation of all rules of consistent interpretation. While in ver. 27, the *coming* is literal, in ver. 28, the *coming Son of Man* is a figure—it is no coming at all—it amounts to nothing more than the destruction of Jerusalem, an event, which was not marked by his coming! And yet there is a difference between the two comings, distinctly marked in the original, though the real coming referred to, be but one, and the same event. The phrase, in the first verse, is this, *μελλει ερχεσθαι* shall hereafter come; in the next verse he solemnly assures them of the certainty of this future event, by the promise that some of those, then present, should actually, before they tasted death, see him, as the *ερχομενος*, THE COMING ONE, IN HIS OWN KINGDOM. Now this was an expression well understood by them. It was as the Coming-One the Jews were wont to speak of Messiah, and accordingly, when the Baptist would enquire of him whether he was the Messiah or not, he put the interrogatory to him thus, *art thou ο ερχομενος* THE COMING ONE, (Matt. xi. 3,) not regarding him as already come, while he appeared only as the Man of Sorrows, having laid his glory by. Again, the multitudes, who attend his triumphant entry into Jerusalem, describe him in their song of praise, not as one, who had already come, but as, *ο ερχομενος* THE COMING ONE *in the name of the Lord*. Matt. xxi. 9. Further, when he utters his pathetic lament over Jerusalem, he limits the term of judicial Jewish blindness in these words, *ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is, ο ερχομενος* THE COMING ONE, *in the name of the Lord*, a passage, which corroborates the view I have endeavoured to establish in the preceding letter, that he shall be hailed with delight and faith, by the Jews, on his return. When Hosannas linger on their tongues, and they are in expectation of his approach, then shall they see him. Now, when the Disciples saw Jesus, they saw the *Coming-One*; but when, with their naked eyes, they only saw the manhood, they did not see him, as the *Coming-One, in his kingdom*. This, however, he promises, that some of them should see, before they tasted death. And the three Evangelists, who record the conversation, do one and all proceed immediately to relate the fact of the Transfiguration, which took place a week after, when Peter, James and John were permitted to behold him in *his glory*, Luke ix. 32. While Peter, himself a witness of the wondrous vision, refers to it, as the manifestation of the power

and presence of Jesus in his Majesty. 2 Pet. i. 16—18. Against this view, however, of the subject, Mr. G., argues, *first*, that “the declaration, “Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here,” &c.; not only indicates that the event foretold would be remarkable and uncommon, but also, that its peculiarity consisted, not in the Son of Man coming in his kingdom, but in some, who were then standing there, not tasting of death *before that time*.” In shewing the connection, in which the words really stand, we have, by anticipation, met this argument. For if these words form the close of a continuous discourse relating to the coming of the Son of Man, we are not to suppose that the subject is immediately abandoned, and that an abrupt promise of longevity, totally unconnected with the matter in hand, is addressed to some of the auditors, and linked to the original exhortation by words, apparently similar in sense, and nearly so in expression, but utterly dissimilar in the covert meaning intended to be conveyed. The promise is not a promise of longevity, but a promise, that while yet in the flesh, they should see the *Coming-One, in his kingdom*; the sole peculiarity being, that this marvellous pledge should be afforded to some of them, that the Son of Man shall, indeed, come in the glory of the Father and reward his servants. *Secondly*, Mr. Gipps, *could not see*, how a brief transfiguration a few days after can be considered as his “coming in his kingdom,” or as in Mark xi., “the kingdom of God coming with power.” But St. Peter could;—the very word in Mark, to which Mr. Gipps referred as so staggeringly emphatic, (*ἐν δυνάμει*), *in power*, is that precisely, which the eye-witness of the transfiguration employs to express that characteristic of Messiah in glory, which was proved by that very event to be no cunningly devised fable, which was declared by him, *the power*, (*δυνάμει*), of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Pet. i. 16. *Thirdly*, Mr. Gipps discovered a coincidence between this promise directly made before the transfiguration, and another statement, which contained no promise, interpreted as referring to John in the record itself, which was spoken after the resurrection, John xxi. 23. So far was it from being a promise of protracted life to John, that he himself expressly says, *Jesus said NOT unto him, He shall not die, BUT IF I WILL that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee*. “If I will;”—is this the language of promise, or of prophecy? Is it not the mere expression of the possibility of its being Messiah’s will, that John should continue till he came? It matters not what historians relate of his surviving the fall of Jerusalem thirty years. The fall of Jerusalem is not identical with the coming of the Son of Man. Strange that he should have been thought to have come then, by those, who deny him to have been seen

coming on the holy mount, by Peter, James and John. If there was intended to be any intimation given, John xxi. 23, that John should not die before the Son of Man came, then is he certainly still living, and has never seen death. The passage can admit of no other interpretation. Mr. Gipps was again misled by his coincidences. But he adduces "a similar declaration concerning Christ's coming. Matt. x. 23. 'When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come.' Here," he adds, "Jesus declared to the Apostles that some *coming of his would take place, before they had gone through all the cities of Israel to preach the Gospel.*" He thus leaves it. But we must not leave it here. This chapter contains at length those ample instructions addressed to the twelve, on being appointed to the exercise of the Apostolic office, wherein he informed them of the treatment they should receive at a subsequent period from the Gentiles, (v. 19.) and the consequences, which should result to others, upon the reception of the Gospel (v. 21.) insomuch that the nearest relatives should deliver up the faithful confessors of the truth to death. He then addeth, what is applicable to the case of all disciples as well to them, "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake; but he that endureth to the end shall be saved; but when they persecute you in this city," &c., then follow the words under consideration, in connection with which nineteen verses of general application are appended. I judge, therefore, that the verse in question, from the connection in which it stands, is not to be considered as exclusively addressed to the Apostles themselves. The commission given to them to disciple all nations, with the annexed promise, that Christ would be with them to the consummation of the age, with which His Gospel concludes, is considered to be of universal obligation, and to bear equally on the case of those, who have succeeded to their labours, and yet that commission embraces not even a distant allusion to any other labourers in the vineyard than themselves. Can I then be wrong in concluding, when such an allusion is made, that they are not themselves the only individuals referred to in a passage, thus embodied, in so general a discourse? I am aware that the words are commonly interpreted to relate to the itinerary of the Apostles, through the towns of Judea. But the words, *ye shall not finish* (τελεσητε) *the cities of Israel*, rather refer to a work to be accomplished on the cities of Israel, that to a mere visitation of them. This same verb I find employed by Christ in that expiring utterance, by which he expressed the perfection of his atonement, (τετελεσται) *It is finished.* John xix. 30. Paul uses

it to denote the perfection of legal righteousness; "shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfil (τελειουσα) the law, judge thee," &c.; Rom. ii. 27. James likewise employs it in the same sense; "If ye fulfil (τελειετε) the royal law." Jam. ii. 8. I regard our Lord therefore as saying, not, *ye shall not finish YOUR TOUR of the cities*, but *ye shall not finish THE REFORMATION of the cities of Israel*, ye shall not perfect these cities, till the Son of Man be come. Observe now the words are the cities of ISRAEL. Is there not a reference here to the unrestored *ten tribes*? They were not then in the land, and could not then have been visited. Their restoration shall not take place till after the coming of the Son of Man; Isa. lxvi. 20, and their moral visitation shall not therefore be effected till then. But suppose the ordinary rendering to be correct, even a literal visit to the cities of their sojourn, where they are concealed till the end come, shall not be effected even by missionary labours, till the Lord's return. Further, if the cities are to be understood of the actual cities then existing in Canaan, the statement admits of a just Scriptural exposition, without, for a moment, acquiescing in Mr. Gipps' view of the subject. The Apostles were sent on this embassy at an early period of Christ's ministry, and the circumstance of their being thus commissioned is actually related six chapters before the account of the transfiguration. But we have already proved that three of the Apostles then saw the Messiah as the Coming-One in his kingdom. Christ may therefore have designed to intimate, that they should not have gone through the cities of Israel before this vision of himself, as the Coming-One, had taken place.

PROPHECY OF THE JUDGMENT.—Matt. xxiv.

Mr. Gipps would have it, however, that it is a figurative coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, that is referred to above, and "in confirmation of this" he appealed to the very solemn and obscure prediction of our Lord in reply to the double question of the disciples, *when shall these things be?* the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, "and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the consummation of the age?" Matt. xxiv. 4. In his elaborate reply he both describes the ruin of the city, and the awful events, which shall precede and accompany his own lightning-like coming. I say it is *obscure* from the manner, in which, according to prophetic usage, the two events are intertwined, and the manner in which commentators have treated it. To unfold it in all its bearings, as it ought to be, would occupy a treatise as long as Mr. Gipps' own, and I therefore refer you, in the mean time, to a paper of great

value on the subject, under the signature of M. in the Christian Herald, vol. iii. p. 188. Though I agree not with the *whole* of the article, yet it is abundantly sufficient to prove, that Mr. G.'s theory of interpretation is erroneous. I may, however, in passing, put a few questions on the subject, which may tend to disentangle the prediction from the knotted mass, into which modern Interpreters have brought it. Was the sun darkened, did the moon withdraw her light, did the stars fall from heaven, and were the powers of heaven shaken, at the fall of Jerusalem? I may be answered, that all this was effected symbolically, as it affected the Jewish state. But the Jewish state had long previously become a non-entity. Prodigies in the heavens, it may be rejoined, are related by Josephus, to have taken place. I ask, admitting them to have really taken place, (though I suspect them to be as apocryphal as any related by Livy,) were they prodigies such as these? Was the sign of the Son of Man noticed in heaven? Seeing him come in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, "did all the tribes of the earth mourn?" Did his own (*αυτου*) messengers issue forth, with a trumpet of great compass, and gather together his own (*αυτου*) elect, (whom I believe to be the 144,000 sealed of Israel,) from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other? Was that the day and hour, of which no man knew any thing save the Father only? Was that the period, which was antitypical to the day of Noah? Was that the day, in the expectation of which the Church is required to watch, to stand in readiness as against a thief, or as servants in obedient fulfilment of duty, awaiting their Lord's return? He, who can answer these questions, in the affirmative, should never complain of the imaginative powers or credulity of others. Yet must all these questions be so answered, before it can be shewn that this prophecy speaks of Christ as coming in any sense at the siege of Jerusalem. I know there is yet one resort, which such expositors have recourse to, "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Mede proposes to translate γενεα *nation*—this nation shall not pass, in which he is now followed by Faber; but I prefer Faber's former criticism, who is no Millenarian, *this generation shall not pass till all these things be a-fulfilling*, or be put in the course of fulfilment, such being the force of the Greek Aorist. Or it may mean this *race* (that is the Jews,) though they shall be destroyed as an εθνος, a state or community living together, shall be preserved till all, &c. An extra attempt to pin down all this prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem is made by Mr. Gipps, by appealing to the closing words of the

PARABLE OF THE FIG-TREE, AND ALL THE TREES. Luke xxi.

which is incorporated into the prophecy by both Evangelists, in their record of what the Lord said on the occasion, and which he affirms to be "connected *with the time* of the destruction of Jerusalem." How it is so connected he has not informed us. But what saith the Parable? as the Fig-tree shooteth forth at the approach of summer, "so likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. There is no resemblance between the shooting forth of a fig-tree, and the destruction of Jerusalem. The fall of the city was more analogous to the fall of the leaf and the approach of winter, than to the budding honours of a forest and the approach of summer. But perhaps there was some confusion here, and that the parable really in Mr. Gipps' mind was that of the *Fig-tree* alone, Luke xiii. 6—9, which having three years been visited by the Lord of the Vineyard, as the Jewish Church was by the Saviour, through the corresponding period of his ministry, and found to be still barren, was nevertheless allowed to continue a short space, as a cumberer of the ground, in the gracious hope, that being carefully attended to by Apostles and Evangelists, it might yet blossom and bud and bring forth fruit to perfection, the fearful alternative being, that it should be cut down without mercy should no fruit be discovered. I can understand how this parable might have been running in the mind of our author, which he may very properly have connected with the destruction of Jerusalem; and I can further understand how he might, very naturally, and very properly also, have viewed it, as illustrated by the symbolic action of our Lord, on his departure from Bethany, the morrow after his triumphant entry into Jerusalem, when "seeing a fig-tree afar off, having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon; and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves, for, was it not the time of figs?" I read this interrogatively, the season for gathering figs was not arrived, and therefore he ought to have found them thereon; "and Jesus answered and said unto it, no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for *or* to the age," Mark xi. 12, 14. I must detain you with a few remarks on

THE GOSPEL KINGDOM.

There is scarcely a more common phrase than this, yet has it no scripture warrant. It is still less correct than that, with which the platforms of our societies abound, where we so often hear "the extension of the *Redeemer's kingdom*," spoken of. This latter may be understood, though not intended, scrip-

turally, if we attach to it the sense I have spoken of, as designed to be conveyed by the formula, *the kingdom of Heaven* in the parables. The gospel can neither *reign* nor be *reigned over*. The word itself is but an abbreviation of the larger phrase "The glad tidings of the kingdom of the Heavens." This is one instance of the inaccuracy, with which men allow themselves to quote Scripture. A further plea is advanced in support of the notion, that Christ came, as affirmed, at the siege of Jerusalem, because, as stated, the Scriptures constantly refer to his various

FIGURATIVE COMINGS.

This word *figurative*, on which we shall hereafter have more to observe, is often a good help to spiritualizers. I deny that there is, or ever has been, any coming of Christ, which can be called *figurative*. He did not come in a figure when he was born of the Virgin; he will not come in a figure when every eye shall see him. Neither is the coming of the Comforter to the church, as the manifester of Jesus, a figure. And if this be no figure, neither is the promise, which accompanied it, of the abiding presence of the Three in One, with the lovers of Jesus, a figure. "If any man love me he will keep my words; and my father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him, John xiv. 23. Is it a figure that Christ is formed, in such, the hope of glory—that he is one with them and they are one with him—that they shall continue in the Son and in the Father? Can such a truth as this be confounded, by any of the Lord's children, with the predictions of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, with the glory of his Father, accompanied by his own angels? I argue now on the idea that the above words have the meaning usually ascribed to them, but I rather regard them as containing a prophecy of Christ's future coming to his church, as their abiding friend and counsellor, when he shall no more remove himself from the midst of them. I am the more inclined to this view of the subject, from the language, which he adopts in the close of the epistle to the angel of the church of Laodicea. But of this in its order, for this likewise is appealed to as a coming in a figure, with various other notices of the coming of the Lord, in the epistles to the seven churches, at which we must now glance *seriatim*.

I must premise, that while there was an applicability in these various epistles to the circumstances and histories of the various churches, which are named, yet are they to be considered of just the same general character with the inspired epistles of the apostles of our Lord—Nay more, as being themselves predictions, prefixed to the most symbolical of all books

of prophecy, they are to be regarded as embodying the practical conclusions, which it is essential we should draw from the contemplation of those revealed purposes of the Almighty, yet to be developed in act. There is something in the very structure of these epistles, which prepares us at once to expect something of more general concernment than the mere local circumstances, that affected these particular churches. *Seven* characteristics are employed in the preceding vision to mark out the regal dignity and glory of Jesus. One of these *seven-fold* features of the son of God, in his *apocalypse*, is selected to be prefixed, rather than his own name, to each of the *seven* epistles, till the whole have been enumerated in rotation. He is, amongst other attributes, described as the possessor of the *seven* spirits, and of the *seven* stars, and I therefore regard his addresses to the *seven* angels, as forming one *complete* exhortation, according to the mystic import of the word *seven*, to the church universal, from the great Bishop and Shepherd of souls. In this judgment I am further warranted by the remarkable conclusion to each, "he that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the CHURCHES;" not, let it be remembered, to this church or to that church, or to the seven churches, but to *the churches*. They have all, moreover, a direct bearing on the period of the second advent, and chiefly concern the church at that juncture. For instance the Spirit's promise to the conqueror, that he shall "eat of the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God," Rev. ii. 7. comp. xxii. 2; that he shall "not be hurt of the second death," Rev. ii. 11, comp. xx. 6; that he shall receive a stone inscribed with a new name unknown to all but himself, Rev. ii. 17, comp. xix. 12; that he shall be given the morning star, Rev. ii. 28, comp. xx. 16, and 2 Pet. i. 19; that he shall be clothed in white raiment, remain unblotted from the book of life, and be confessed before the Father, Rev. iii. 5, comp. Rev. ix. 14—xvii. 12, xxi. 27. and Matt. x. 32; that he shall be a pillar in the temple and go no more out, and be inscribed with the name of the New Jerusalem descending from God, and with the new name of Jesus, Rev. iii. 12, comp. xxi.; that he shall have power over the nations, rule them with a rod of iron, and sit down with Jesus on his own throne, even as he has sat down with the Father on his throne, Rev. ii. 27, iii. 21, comp. Rev. xii. 5, xx. 4, all these promises assuredly relate to a time yet future. Add to these some direct references to the last times, which must relate to the church at the final crisis of her militant estate; as for instance, the address to Pergamos is to one, who dwelleth where SATAN'S THRONE is. It is vain to say that this pre-eminence in evil belonged to Pergamos, because of its extraordinary wealth, but refer to Rev.

xiii. 2, 8, and see if it be not connected with universal domination as exercised against the saints, such as never was possessed or exercised by Pergamos. Again, censure is passed on the same angel for encouragement afforded to those, who held the nefarious doctrine of Balaam, who, when he could not destroy Israel, through covetousness, advised that their ruin should be compassed by seducing them into idolatry. Now two apostles refer to this very Balaam as the type of the final apostacy. Peter, in making known the power and coming of our Lord Jesus, and enforcing duty with reference to the day of God, proceeds to forewarn us of the false prophets, who are to arise, *through covetousness* making merchandise of us with feigned words, "which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness, but was rebuked, for his iniquity, the dumb ass speaking with man's voice having forbidden the madness of the prophet," 2 Pet. ii. 1—3, 15, 16. While Jude more briefly notices the matter v. 11, "woe unto them, for they have walked in the way of Cain, rushed eagerly on in the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gain-saying of Core." But besides these remarkable references to the future, I meet with these striking words in the epistle to Philadelphia, "because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee FROM THE hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth," Rev. iii. 10. This promise must surely regard the faithful *in the season* of temptation, (*της μελλουσας ερχεσθαι*) *which shall hereafter come on the whole* ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ, INHABITED EARTH, of which we meet with a description, Isa. xxiv. 17—23; Dan. xii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 8—12. These considerations all lead me to the full conviction that the *seven* epistles, while they were specially addressed to the churches named, were only addressed to them in type, and were designed for the church in its septiform condition, at the time of the end; and such substantially is the view of the learned Vitringa, who was not a millenarian. This being the case, I now come to the examination of those passages in them, to which Mr. Gipps refers, as expressive of certain *figurative* comings of Christ.

I. He thus begins:—"To the Angel of Ephesus it is said, "I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent." Rev. ii. 5. The prospect of Christ's coming is constantly, through Scripture, pressed on the conscience of the believer, and of the Minister in particular, as a motive of action. Thus, 1 Thess. ii. 19, Paul asks, as concerning himself, "what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? are not even ye, in the presence of our Lord Jesus

Christ, AT HIS COMING.” It is in the view of Christ’s coming and the position they will then occupy, as having by him been built on the true foundation, that he considers them his glory and joy; because like the purer metals and the precious stones they will withstand the trial of the fire. See 1 Cor. iii. 11—14. Now, in exact contrast to the case of Paul, but looking onward, just to the same event, the Presbytery are addressed in the person of the Ephesian angel, and threatened with the loss of their candlestick or church; or its removal from the place it occupied with reference to Jesus. Its proper place was not Ephesus, defiled with the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, but the Periphery of that circle, in the midst of which stood the Son of Man in all his glory. He came not to root out a church from the city of Diana, but he will come to level with the dust the pretensions of every unrepentant professing church, and then shall they, who laboured in the word and doctrine, amongst them, lose their reward, even though they themselves were personally faithful.

2. We are next referred to “His coming quickly to the Church of Pergamos to fight against those, who hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes,” (Rev. ii. 22, 25)—as he will also against those, who hold the doctrine of Balaam. We have already shewn, that this doctrine has reference to a future period; to that last form of delusion, which shall arise before the coming of the Son of Man. Eichorn, a German Theologian, from whom Mr. Irving seems reluctantly to dissent, considers the Balaam and the Nicolas to be the same persons from the remarkable identity in the import of their names, the one in Hebrew and the other in Greek, denoting *the Conqueror of the people*. I believe the doctrine to be the same, but the individuals to be different, though allied enemies of the Lord—the latter being the anti-type of Balak. I see them both developed in the history of the two beasts of Rev. xiii. The Balak being the last head of the ten-horned beast set up, as the true Antichrist, for universal adoration; and the Balaam being the governing head of the two horned beast in his last estate, the false Prophet. They are both confederate for the same evil purpose, and exercise concurrently a mysterious power “over all kindreds, and tongues and people.” The church, which can endure, in the midst of her, the maintainers of such a doctrine, is called on to *repent*, or she will be involved in the same ruin with the beast and the false prophet, at the coming of Christ; for *he will fight against her with the sword of his mouth*, the very instrument wherewith he is described as fighting with the Beast, and the false Prophet, Rev. xix. 15—21. The identity of character, of name, and of end, completely establish this point. As there

were many Antichrists in John's days, so I doubt not there was much of the Balaam and Balak delusion abroad, against which, it was important to caution the infant church, and they also were required to direct their faith and their hope onward to the final issue, as was the church at Thessalonica; "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love, one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you; to the end he may establish you hearts, unblameable in holiness before God, even our father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints," 1 Thess. iii. 12—13. Who ever regarded this as a figurative coming, and yet was it written to, and of men, who have been above seventeen centuries asleep in Jesus?

3. We are directed to the coming *in figure* "against the antinomian characters in the church at Thyatira, Rev. ii. 22—25." I admit there is a coming spoken of, but not against Thyatira. "That which ye have, hold fast till I come," (ver. 25.) are the words of exhortation to the faithful themselves, answering in substance precisely, to the words last quoted from Thessalonians. They follow indeed, the intimation given of the fearful end of *the woman Jezebel*, and her paramours; the very counterpart she is of the woman that rideth the Beast, Rev. xvii. She is the apostate church, with whom spiritual fornication is committed. Her ruin is attributed to Jesus truly; "Behold I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her, into great tribulation;" but this is not stated to be effected by him, at the period of his coming. Neither is the ruin of the whore of Babylon. She is to be desolated by the *ten horns*, Rev. xvii. 16, for God shall put it into their hearts to fulfil his will, and great tribulation shall ensue to her paramours, Rev. xviii. 9—11—15—19. Such is the connection, in which these words stand; and, from the whole tone of the epistle, it is quite obvious that it is to the second advent of the Lord Jesus we are referred, when we are required to hold fast that, which we have.

4. Appeal is now made to "His coming as a thief upon the church of Sardis," (Rev. iii. 3.) What other coming can this possibly refer to, than that spoken of? Matt. xxiv. 43. "Know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore, be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." What else can it denote than what is referred to, 1 Thess. v. 1—2. But of the times and the seasons, "brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh, as a thief in the night." Who ever was so wedded to system as to regard this

as descriptive, not of the second coming of Jesus, but of the hour of death? Has not Peter said the "day of the Lord will come, (not the day of death) as a thief in the night; in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise; and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, &c." 2 Pet. iii. 20. And finally, is not this gracious warning prefixed to the account of the dreadful day of Armageddon? "Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." Rev. xvi.

5. The next reference is more extraordinary still, "His *coming* in the judgments, which he was about to execute on the Roman empire, and from which he promised to *keep* the church at Philadelphia," (Rev. iii. 10, 11.) Really it is too much to assume at once the reference to Rome, with which there is nothing whatever to identify the prediction, and the character of the Coming. I have already spoken of the first verse, and referred to other Scriptures for the import of *the hour of temptation*, which is assuredly yet future. But whatever it be, it is not identified necessarily with the Coming, which is thus spoken of separately—"Behold, I come quickly; hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown," Rev. iii. 11. Is not this as applicable to us as to them? Was it on the downfall of Rome this crown was to be awarded or periled? If I be correct in my reading of Scripture it is only to be conferred in the same day with Paul's. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me AT THAT DAY, and not to me only, but to ALL THEM also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 8. If those of Thyatira, here spoken of, were amongst the *all*, who love the appearing of Jesus, then must they wait till *that day* to receive their crown—but that day is the day of Christ's appearing, that concerning which he hath said, *behold, I come quickly*.

6. "We are directed to his *coming in and supping with* any individual believer in the corrupt church of Laodicea, who should *open the door*, that is, of the church, at the door or outside of which Jesus declares himself to be standing." The words, referred to, immediately follow a general call to repentance, and are introductory to that promise of a crown to the conqueror, already noticed. I have no doubt whatever, that they contain a promise of participation in the enjoyment of the marriage supper of the Lamb. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." The interposing door I believe to be that of the heart and not merely of the church, seeing we are individually spoken to—

the promise is, that if it be opened to receive him at his summons, they who open it shall sup together with him at his Coming. To the denunciation against the rich, who heap up treasure together FOR THE LAST DAYS, this exhortation, with reference to the *second* advent, is appended—"Be patient, therefore, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord*. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for *the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*. Grudge not against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned; *Behold, the Judge standeth before the door.*" James v. 7, 9. The demand for admission is made—his personal appeal to the heart and the affections is enforced. The supper is ready—But, as the master of the house long absent, he shall speedily make a claim for admission into his proper dwelling the church also. Alas! that so many of his servants should have said in their hearts, my Lord delayeth his coming. To him the porter openeth, and the sheep know his voice. They truly shall sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. To them, and them only, will he come in and feast with them. Till the King has solemnly viewed the guests, and cast out the unprofitable servants, he will not make his appearance. Such is the promise; one, which I maintain to be as much a promise of good things to come, as is the promise of the throne which follows. These are then the places to which Mr. Gipps referred to establish his point of figurative comings. I simply ask, was he warranted in following them up with such a conclusion as this?—"These prophecies have ALL been fulfilled, *these comings* have ALL taken place, yet Christ has not come *personally* in any one of them!!!" Nay, but they all relate to one coming, and that coming is future and shall be personal.

THE LAST DAY.

Much importance is attached to this expression, and many passages quoted to prove, that the judgment, both of the just and of the unjust, is to take place therein. This I have no hesitation in admitting; neither do I doubt that it coincides, though it is not altogether of the same import, with, "the day of judgment,—the day of God,—the day in which the Son of man shall be revealed, &c." But I do deny it to be a day of four-and-twenty hours. *The day of God* is not necessarily more brief in duration, than that whereof Christ speaketh when he saith, "your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad," John viii. 56. Was the day of Messiah, which he saw, and which gladdened him with its glory, a period so evanescent as that, which we measure by a single

revolution of the earth upon her axis? Ah! no, he saw the promises of millennial blessedness *afar off*, was persuaded of them, and for the joy, which was set before him, cheerfully avowed himself a pilgrim, Heb. xi. 13. But to come nearer the matter,—the expression in the New Testament, is borrowed from the Old,—“The day of the Lord is at hand,” saith the prophet Isaiah, “It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty,” Isa. xiii. 6. But it appears that this shall not be, in Mr. Gipps’s sense, *the last day*, which shall shine upon the world; though it will be the last of grace to the mystic Assyrian. For then mercy shall be extended to Jacob; Israel also shall be established in the land, they shall rule over their oppressors—“It shall come to pass *in that day* that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon—I will break the Assyrian in my land,” Isa. xiv. 1—4, 25. The literal Assyrian, be it remembered, perished at Babylon. Again, “*that day*, Matt. vii. 22,” when the kingdom of heaven shall be entered on, is met with, repeatedly, in this prophet. Thus, *in that day* “there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; of him shall the Gentiles enquire, (oracularly,) and his rest shall be glorious.” This surely relates to the day of the Messiah, which Abraham saw and was glad. “And it shall come to pass, *in that day*, The Jehovah shall set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people.” There shall be an high way also from Assyria to Egypt, Isa. xi. 10, 11, 16. “And *in that day* shall ye say, Praise the Lord—cry out and shout thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee,” Isa. xii. 1, 4—6. Turn now to Joel, whose predictions all relate to *that day*. He exhorts to deep abasement, and adds, “alas for *the day!* for *the day of the Lord* is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come,” Joel i. 15. Now observe his statement concerning *that day*, to which he constantly refers through the remainder of the prophecy—the land is in a state of desolation, 16, 20.—the day cometh, and the army of impalpable spirits, before whom a fire burneth, and before whom Jehovah uttereth his voice, proceed to execute their fearful commission, ii. 1—11; fertility, along with the former and the latter rain, is restored; while joy, and a brow unclouded with shame, mark the happy condition of Israel, in the midst of whom Jehovah taketh his station, 21—27. The day of the Lord is now identified with the termination of the *last days*, and the spirit is poured forth upon all flesh, 28—32. The captivity of Judah and Jerusalem is re-

stored—the nations are gathered in the valley of Jehoshaphat—Jehovah sitteth there to judge them—the harvest and vintage take place; “Jehovah also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem;” he shall dwell in Zion, “be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel;”—yea, IN THAT DAY wine and milk shall drop down from the mountains—a fountain proceed from the house of the Lord.—Egypt and Edom shall be desolated—Judah shall dwell for ever, and her blood be cleansed, iii. 1—21. The predictions of Zephaniah are just to the same effect; “the day of the *Lord* is at hand; for the *Lord* hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath bid his guests. It shall come to pass in the day of the *Lord*’s sacrifice that I will punish the princes, &c.” Jerusalem shall be searched with candles; the fire of jealousy shall burn the whole land, Zeph. i. 7—18; the nation not desired is invited to assemble, before THE DAY OF THE LORD’S ANGER cometh upon her, and the meek of the earth are exhorted to righteousness, that they may be hid “in the day of the Lord’s anger;”—Moab and Ammon, Ethiopia, and Assyria, are given to the spoil, while the former are especially conferred on Israel; the Elohim of the heathen are to be famished, and “men shall worship *Jehovah*, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen,” ii. 1—15. The filthy city is reproved and purified by judgment, iii. 1—7; they are commanded to wait on the Lord till THE DAY that he rises up to the prey; his determination to gather the nations, and devour them with the fire of his jealousy, is expressed. “Then will I turn to the people a pure lip, that they may all call upon the name of the *Lord*, to serve him with one shoulder. From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants, even the daughter of my dispersed, shall bring mine offering. In that day thou shalt not be ashamed for all thy doings;” the daughter of Zion is exhorted to rejoice; her judgments are taken away, her enemy cast out; “the *King of Israel*, the *Jehovah*, is in the midst of thee; thou shalt not see evil any more. In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, Fear not; and to Zion, let not thy hands be slack; the *Lord* thy God, in the midst of thee, is mighty; he will save, he will rejoice over thee with singing;” they who afflicted her shall be undone; in every land, where they were put to shame, they shall obtain praise and fame. “At that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you, for I shall make you a name and a praise among all the people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord,” 8—20. From this abstract of these two prophets, who have written so largely on the day of the *Lord*, it is obvious that *that day* embraces the destruction

of the assembled nations; the desolation of Israel, and the blessedness she consequently obtains under the gracious rule of THE KING OF ISRAEL, JEHOVAH, who shall *dwell in the midst of her*, even in Zion, the city of her solemnities. It must therefore embrace a period of very considerable duration.

Various references are made to *the last day* in John. Four of these are distinct promises to those, whom the Father hath given to Jesus, and who believe in him; who are drawn to him of the Father; who partake of his flesh and blood, that he will raise them up at the last day, John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54. If these promises have any definite meaning, they imply that the *resurrection of the last day* will be confined to those, who were given to, believed in, were drawn unto, and partook of Jesus. Martha expresses her conviction, John xi. 24, "that her brother shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." This conviction of hers, however, cannot be considered as decisive of the general question, as it concerns only an individual; but that individual, nevertheless, was one whom Jesus loved. But it is written, concerning another class of characters, "he that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day," John xii. 48. Now here is nothing stated concerning the resurrection of the rejecter of Jesus; but there is of the decision of the word concerning him *at the last day*. It shall exclude him from the resurrection of the just, of those who confessed Jesus; he shall not rise—that is the judgment written concerning him. To rise then, he must have confessed Jesus—have been given to him, believed in him, been drawn to him of the Father, and have partaken of his flesh and of his blood.—It will then appear that he had no life in him—that he did not possess eternal life.

The case of the various cities of the plain have been referred to, as spoken of by our Lord, in reference to *the day of judgment*. If you examine your Greek Testament you will find the article omitted in all the places where they are spoken of, (Matt. x. 15. xi. 22, 24.) It is not in *the day of judgment*, but in *a day of judgment*, "visitation by temporal calamities," it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, &c., as long since noticed by Dr. Hales, in his *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. ii. page 119—8vo. Lon. 1830. Where the future condemnation of the unjust departed is spoken of, the same form of expression is used—an account shall be given of every idle word, *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως*, in *a day of judgment*. Matt. xii. 36. The unjust are to be reserved *for a day of judgment*, *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως*, 2 Pet. ii. 9. The heavens and the earth are also kept in store against *a day of judgment and perdition of the ungodly men*, the period of

this ruin is circumscribed, and extendeth not through the whole term of *the judgment*. 2 Pet. iii. 7. But John speaking of those, who shall be raised in the last day, says, Herein is our love made perfect that we may have boldness, *εν τη ημερα της κρισεως*, IN THE DAY OF THE JUDGMENT. 1 John iv. 17, that is, throughout the entire period, which extendeth from the occupation of the thrones, *at the first resurrection*, to the judgment before the white throne. The same distinction is to be observed in the kindred expression, Jude 6—"the messengers, which kept not their principality, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in chains of Hades under darkness unto a judgment of a great day," *εις κρισιν μεγαλης ημερας*—there is nothing definite in the verse, which pointeth out any particular great day, yet it must doubtless be that, when the dead small and great stand before the great white throne. But there is another day appointed for judgment of the ungodly living, the nations, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, to which we are manifestly referred in the next place, that is cited by Mr. Gipps. Acts xvii. 31. *He hath appointed A DAY, in which he will judge the OIKOUMENE, the platform of the empire of the beast, in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, affording assurance thereof to all, raising him out of dead ones.* This passage is also made the subject of a separate article. It is difficult to determine at first sight, to which judgment, that in the valley of decision, or that before the white throne it may refer, but from the mention of the *Oikoumene, inhabited earth*, I doubt not it is the former. The appointment of such a day was in itself abundant evidence that God would no longer wink at idolatry, and the necessity of repentance was justly argued therefrom. The judgment by the law shall be *in a day εν ημερα, when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus*. Rom. iii. 16. Herein there is no definite allusion to a particular day, as in our version. "The day, in which the Son of Man shall be revealed," Luke xvii. 30, is limited by the very terms employed and by the context to the actual moment of his Apocalypse "when one shall be taken," *i. e.*, rapt up into glory, "and another left," the morning of the first resurrection. But it seems surprising Mr. Gipps should have referred to it, when he has interpreted the whole of the prophecy as given by St. Matthew, of the figurative coming of Messiah to destroy Jerusalem. "The day of the Lord Jesus," 1 Cor. v. 5, which is identical with the day of the Messiah, that Abraham longed to see, is here spoken of as that, in which the fallen brother, having undergone due discipline, may be saved. Now this is the very character we attribute to the Millennial day, the day of Messiah, the day of perfect bliss and consummation to Abra-

ham's seed, the heirs of those promises. THE DAY OF THE LORD JESUS is again employed to denote the period of their enjoyment, 2 Cor. i. 14, "we are your rejoicing, even as ye also are our's, in the day of the Lord Jesus." After a like manner THE LORD'S DAY, which cometh as a thief on the ungodly world, then dreaming of safety and peace, is mentioned (1 Thess. v. 2—11) as presenting a widely different aspect to the CHILDREN OF THE DAY. "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness that *the day* should overtake you as a thief. God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him, wherefore comfort yourselves together and edify one another, even as also ye do." In a place, to which we must hereafter refer, *the Lord's day* is again spoken of in its thief-like approach, as presenting to the faithful an object of earnest desire and an incitement to Christian holiness. 2 Pet. iii. 10—13. *Messiah's day*, that which Abraham rejoiced to see, is by this very name described, as not being then *instant*, for the comfort of the Thessalonian Church, who were fearful, it seems, of being overtaken by the time of tribulation, which precedes its dawn, 2 Thess. ii. 2. *That day*, (*ἡ ἡμετέρα ἐκείνη*.) is emphatically referred to as the day, when many, who have not done the Father's will, shall in vain claim admission to the kingdom, Matt. vii. 22; as that, in which the kingdom of God has come, Luke x. 12; as that, which shall come unawares on the carnal, Luke xxi. 34; As that in which Jesus shall be glorified in his Saints, 2 Thess. i. 10; as that against which Paul had entrusted his all to the Saviour's sentinelship, 2 Tim. i. 12; as that, in which it was prayed for Onesiphorus he might find mercy, 2 Tim. i. 18; and finally as that, in which the crown of righteousness should be awarded to those, who love the Epiphany or glorious appearing of the Lord. Such are Mr. Gipps' references; but I add, that it occurs in other places, which he has not noticed, as for instance, "of *that day* and hour knoweth no man," Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32,—but this was supposed to have reference to the siege of Jerusalem. His own criticism, however, overturns his theory. Again—"I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until *that day* when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25. He that is on the house-top IN THAT DAY must not come down to take his stuff out of the house, Luke xvii. 31. We now come to a very important place on the context of which, (that is John xiv. 23,) I have already pronounced my opinion—"at *that day* ye shall know that I am in my Father and you in me and I in you," John xiv. 20. The witness of the spirit might

now persuade them of the fact, but *then* the proof of it shall be submitted to their very senses. This interpretation is further justified by the preceding promise, "I will not leave you orphans,"—the Spirit should be sent to them during his absence. And further he addeth another promise "I will come to you," ver. 18. In conformity with which he saith afterwards, "ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you," ver. 27. There can be no doubt that this referreth to the second advent, and therefore his coming to them, their acquaintedness in that day with his unity with the Father, and their unity with him, (ver. 20,) and his coming with the Father to abide with them, (ver. 23,) are all identical. Lastly, we meet with it in the description of the fight of Armageddon, which introduces the thousand years; and therefore must precede the judgment before the great white throne by at least that term of time, (Rev. xvi. 14,) "they are the spirits of demons working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole *Oikoumene*, inhabited earth, and the battle of *that great day*, of Almighty God." Now observe, they are not said to be collected to *battle at the great day*, but to the *battle of that great day*—the battle, by which it is to be distinguished. We thus identify the day of Armageddon's fight with the day of admission to the kingdom; which comes unawares; where Paul's deposit shall be found in safety; when Messiah shall be glorified in his Saints; Onesiphorus find mercy; the crown of righteousness be awarded; the fruit of the vine be partaken of by Messiah and his disciples; the man on the house-top neglect his stuff in the house; the unity of Messiah and the Church be discoverable by sense; and the interminable abode of the Father and the Son, with the Church take place. But it is also *the Lord's day*, and *the day of Messiah*. The day of Messiah, however, embraces many days, for it is written "days shall come, when ye shall desire to see *one of the days* of the Son of Man, and ye shall not see it," Luke xvii. 22. But, according to Mr. Gipps, the other formula we have noticed, *the last day*, *the day of judgment*, &c. all describe the very same day, in its dawn and in its close, with *Messiah's day*, and they therefore must include many days, commencing with the battle of that great day of Almighty God. It will be seen, however, that I do not regard all those formulæ as expressing the entire period of Messiah's day, though they are all identified with it. Some of them are shewn by the context, to describe the judgment on the living at the dawn,—and others the judgment of the dead, small and great, before the white throne far on in the eve of Messiah's day—One other place I have yet to quote, which embraces, in my apprehension, both these judgments.

He, who sees the end from the beginning, takes in both judgments at one glance. Thus in the prophets, he repeatedly represents both advents, as if they were one continuous event; and describes the miraculous effusion of the spirit on the apostles at Pentecost, and *on all flesh* at the close of our dispensation, as if no period intervened, during which there was to be a remarkable cessation of the direct exercise of his power. It is the completion of his purposes; whether of wrath or mercy, he ever delights to describe, and he pauses not to detail the intermediate events, which occasion a pause in the accomplishment of his end. The place I refer to is the address to the profligate, Rom. ii. 5, "but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

From what I have already advanced, it will appear, that I do not rely on the hypothesis, that the last day, or Messiah's day, is to be one of just one thousand years, neither more nor less, which is assumed to be essential to the doctrine of the Millennium. This assumption, however, forms the basis of many an argument, and is asserted to rest on the use, which has been made of 2 Pet. iii. 8. For my own part, however, I am not aware, that more has been inferred from this place, than what must naturally arise from its perusal, viz., that in the divine estimate, the measure of time, being vastly different from man's, a period, which extendeth to a thousand years, is accounted but a day,—a long period is abbreviated; while, on the contrary, a day, in heaven's language, denoteth a thousand years—a short term is elongated; a note of the inspired measurement of time is not given in Psalm xc. 4. It is a general maxim, employed in the place before us, to account, indeed, for the apparent slowness in the execution of the divine purposes, and the suspension, which has taken place, in the thief-like approach of the *Lord's day*, to which the first clause is especially applicable; but still, from its bearing upon that day, which is emphatically the Lord's own, and, therefore, not to be judged of by human criteria, I deem it to convey an intimation, according to the purport of the second clause, that *that day* will actually consist, as we have already seen it will, of a very considerable period. I confine not the period to a thousand years, I believe it will vastly exceed it. The *thousand years* in Rev. xx. 4, are not made the limit of the saint's reign, but of Satan's confinement to the bottomless pit. This remark at once answers a vast portion of the book we are reviewing.

CHRIST'S VOICE HEARD IN THE GRAVE.

It is argued from John v. 28, 29, that all who are in their

graves shall hear that voice, at one and the same time, and come forth at once, either to the resurrection of life, or of damnation. It seems strange to me that no reference should be made to verses 25—27. I quote the whole passage:—25 “*verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, (καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν,) when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.*” 26 “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,” 27 “And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.” 28 “Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in which *all* they in the graves shall hear his very voice;” 29 “And shall come forth. They who have produced good things *at* the resurrection of life, *but* they who have practised evil things *at* the resurrection of judgment.” It is scarcely possible for language to make a greater distinction, as to the time of the resurrection of life, and the time of the resurrection of judgment, than is made in the above verses. The hour is now, from its comparative nearness, when the dead, who hear the voice of him that hath life in himself, shall live;—a statement, which implies, that others shall not *then* hear, and shall not live.—I know the gloss is, that the dead here spoken of are the dead in sin. But the discourse is on the raising of the dead by the Son, in proof of his equality in honour with the Father, who raiseth the dead, and maketh them alive, even as the Son maketh alive those, whom he wills, ver. 21,—judgment is not even exercised by the Father, but is committed to the Son, (ver. 22.) that he may have equal honour, (ver. 23.) In further explication, of which wonderful prerogative, we are presented with reduplicated *amens*, or *verilys*, solemnly authenticating the certainty of its exercise, as evidenced *first* in the communication of the power of his resurrection-life, the eternal life, to those who believe here, “*verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death unto life,*” has experienced already the power of the resurrection, and shall never be arraigned in the judgment, for it only can affect the dead, who have never experienced that power; and *secondly*, in the resurrection of the just, (ver. 25) which we have already cited, “*verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is,*” when the dead, who hear his voice, shall live, when those, who have experienced the power of the resurrection, shall receive the fulness of the blessing, even “the adoption, to wit the redemption of the body.”—These reduplicated AMENS thus present us with the successive exercise of those *greater works* (v. 20) by Jesus, on behalf of his church, which are de-

signed to occasion adoring marvel—*first*, the quickening, by his Spirit, of the dead in sin; and *secondly*, the recall to life, in its utmost bliss and consummation, of those who sleep in Jesus. But great a marvel as is this, another marvel is to follow, for ALL that are in their graves shall hear his voice—they who have produced good, as already stated, “at* the resurrection of life,” when they alone shall hear the voice; and they, who have practiced evil, “at the resurrection of judgment,” whereto the former shall not come.

We have a long critique on the word *Hour*, in order to prove that the coming hour (of ver. 29,) cannot embrace the whole period, which shall elapse between the first resurrection and the judgment before the White Throne, as if it were necessarily confined in import to the 24th part of a day—but in this very chapter, yea, in this very discourse, the same word *αἰς* is employed to denote the whole *season* of John the Baptist’s ministry, (ver. 35.) It marks the *time*, during which the disciples should be persecuted, (John xvi. 2) the *time* in which they should no more be spoken to in proverbs, but shewn plainly of the Father, (John xvi. 25,) that is, according to Beza, *ab ascensione Christi*, when the spirit was poured out, *ad finem usque seculorum*, from the ascension of Christ even to the end of the ages. It must either, in fact, denote with him the whole dispensation of the spirit, or else the Millennial dispensation.—Again, according to “*the commentary of the age*,” as the bishop of Calcutta calls that of Mr. Scott, (and, indeed, I know not that it is even sought to be denied by any,) the same word *hour αἰς* is used to mark out the whole of the Christian dispensation, 1 John ii. 18. “Little children, it is the last time, (hour;) and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time, (hour.)”—Were we to adopt Mr. Gipps’ mode of reasoning here, we might make out that *twenty-three hours* of the last day were expended, when John wrote this. We have only to substitute the word *hour*, for *day*.—None of the hours of the last day, “can be AFTER the last hour, because there can be no hour AFTER THE LAST.” But all the emphasis of type will be insufficient to prove that every hour but one of the last day, was run out in John’s time. And as little can it serve to prove that the last of the all days, during which Christ was to be present, by his spirit, with the ministry, (Mat. xxviii. 20,) or that the last day, even that wherein he shall raise up all, who believed in him, and them only, is the last, which shall dawn upon the earth. But to return, John’s

* *αὐτὸς* has the force of *at*, when applied to any thing which recently preceded, as *life* and *judgment* both had here.

use of the word *hour* corresponds with the usage of the *Seventy*, for they employ it as equivalent with the Hebrew, *סָעָר*, which signifies indefinitely *time* or *season*. No advantage therefore can be derived to Mr. Gipps' theory, from the occurrence of the word *hour* in our Lord's notice of the resurrection of life, and the resurrection of judgment.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST.

All are to appear before it, either to receive the good or the bad according to the things, which they had practised in the body. 2. Cor. v. 10. It is argued from hence, that they are all to do so "at one and the same time." Does it hence follow that they are all to appear there at one and the same time? It were waste of time to pursue this reasoning. One observation, however, on the *Judgment Seat*.* We find this word (*βῆμα*) in Acts xii. 21, translated throne, "on a set day Herod arrayed in royal apparel sat upon his (*βῆμα*) throne." Now, what is the posture of the Saints, before the throne of Christ; and the character, in which they appear there? Is it as parties arraigned before the Judge? Far from it. Their attitude there is not that of persons upon their trial, but of victors, who have fought the fight and gained the prize. "I beheld, and lo! a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands," Rev. vii. 9. Widely different are the circumstances, under which the dead small and great stand before the white throne, Rev. xx. 12. All thus shall indeed stand before the throne of Jesus, but at very different seasons, and for very

* The whole passage runs thus—"We must all appear before the judgment-seat, (throne) of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto GOD—AND I TRUST ALSO, ARE MADE MANIFEST IN YOUR CONSCIENCES." The *men*, whom he would persuade, are thus evidently contrasted with the *brethren*, to whose *consciences* he was made manifest. This view of the subject is much corroborated by the statement of the Apostle, concerning the judicial correction of communicants. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would JUDGE OURSELVES, WE SHOULD NOT BE JUDGED. BUT WHEN WE ARE JUDGED, WE ARE CHASTENED OF THE LORD, THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE CONDEMNED (JUDGED) WITH THE WORLD." 1 Cor. xi. 30—32. Those, who are hereafter to judge the world, are at present invested with authority, an authority, which has indeed, for centuries been paralysed, but still an authority, which ought to be in exercise, to judge their own members. Communication with evil doers being first forbidden, Paul asks "what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without, God judgeth ο Θεος κρινει, Therefore put away from among yourselves, that wicked person," 1 Cor. v. 11—13. Against those who are in Christ Jesus, there is NO CONDEMNATION κατακριμα Rom. viii. 1. A variety of other passages might be quoted to the same effect.

different purposes—the saints to magnify the Lord and to cast their crowns before his feet *at his coming* ; but *the rest of the dead*, when the thousand years are ended, to receive their doom. The terrors of that day caused Paul earnestly to persuade *men*, (mark, not the saints) to repentance and faith. 2 Cor. v. 11.

RETRIBUTION TO ENEMIES.

An argument is drawn from 2 Thess. i. 5—9, that all who troubled his saints of all ages, with all the knowers-not of God, and the obeyers-not of the Gospel shall be punished at the very same time, wherein believers are admitted, by Jesus, into the enjoyment of their rest. The distinction between those, who troubled the Thessalonian converts (ver. 6.) and those, *who know not God*, by whom he understood the Pagans; and *those who obeyed not the Gospel*, by whom he understood the Jews, (ver. 8.) was so manifest to Maeknight, that he interprets the former verse at once of the affliction, which was to be brought upon the Jews, translating it thus:—"Notwithstanding it is just with God to give in return affliction to them who afflict you." I do not, indeed, follow him in his exposition, but I just notice it to shew, that there is nothing in the passage itself, which justifies the idea that this affliction was to be visited on the persecutors in the very same day, wherein the afflicted were to obtain rest. Their rest, indeed, we are distinctly told shall be entered on, *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven*. Now, I rather think it is the change of idiom, by which a substantive is made a verb, and *when* the adverb of time prefixed, which our translators adopted in writing down these words, as expressing the sense of the Greek, which occasioned the misconception I speak of; and caused our much respected author to make the *affliction* which is to be visited on the persecutors synchronize with *the rest* to be conferred on the afflicted. But the original runs literally thus:—"To you, the afflicted, rest with us in the Apocalypse of the Lord Jesus, from Heaven, with messengers of his own energy"—THE REST they shall obtain is actually *in the Apocalypse*, when they shall be associated with the Revealed Jesus and his messengers of energy—while nothing is determined as to the juncture, when the affliction shall come on the persecutors. I have no doubt it will come on them long after the moment of the Apocalypse, even at the judgment before the white throne. But there are enemies noticed in the succeeding verse, on whom vengeance shall be taken, at the very time of the Apocalypse in flaming fire, even the knowers-not of God and the obeyers-not of the Gospel, the Jews and the Gentiles then

living, who shall be gathered together before the Son of Man, as we have already seen, "who shall suffer punishment, the slaying, (*ολεθρον*,*) from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his might, *in that day* when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, &c." This punishment by slaying, which corresponds so accurately with Isa. lxvi. 15-17, and Rev. xix. 21, is here represented you will observe, not as the grand feature of *that day*, but as a mere adjunct,—the *great business* of that day being the glorification of Jesus *through his own Saints*, and the admiration to be won by him, from all the believers. It is not a little remarkable also, that while the whole family named after him are included in the formula, *ALL his Saints*, *ALL the believers*; it is otherwise in the enumeration of his foes, the knowers-not of God, the obeyers-not of the Gospel. I know not that I need trouble you with any further remarks on this passage. I believe I have met all that Mr. Gipps has advanced in the above exposition. I would, however, add here a few remarks, which I have postponed till now, on Dan. xii. 2. I cannot myself discover any force in the idea, that the awaking of some to life and some to shame, in this place, contains the expression of the simultaneous arising of both classes—but, I have so great a respect for Mr. Begg's judgment, I am unwilling altogether to deny the justice of his interpretation, that some of those, who have been eminently wicked, will be raised at the same time with the righteous, and consigned to perdition. But I must own I cannot receive the notion. It appears to me contradictory to the law our Lord has laid down for the resurrection *at the last day*; and in my view of the place I meet with no real difficulty. The many who sleep, of whom Daniel speaks, are evidently Jews. The object of the Spirit in noticing them at all is to mark the period and glorious results of Michael's interference for his people. When he standeth up, for their deliverance from the time of unexampled tribulation, the scattering of the holy people shall be finished, and therefore the Jews restored, (ver. 7;) and so great shall be their enjoyment, and so completely shall the enemy be subdued, that *the wise*, and amongst them Daniel, for he too shall stand in his lot at the end of the days, "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turned many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever," (ver. 3.) It was to introduce this promise to the faithful, the fact of the resurrection was referred to at all, but being referred to, the resurrection of life and the resurrection of judgment are both noticed in one comprehensive glance of the end from the

* This word is used as the exponent of הכהיר to cut off, 1 Kings xiii. 3, 4, by the lxx.

beginning, just as we have already seen to be the case in the parallel place of John v. 29. I am the more confirmed in this for three reasons:—

1. There is no note of time given in v. 2, by which the two resurrections are made synchronical.

2. Without expatiating on the resurrection of some to shame and everlasting contempt, he contents himself with the mere notice of the fact, and then returns to detail the character of the retribution; but goes on immediately to describe the glory of the some, with whose resurrection to everlasting life he had commenced the statement, being only for a moment diverted from it, that the ungodly might know there will also be a resurrection of judgment; and,

3dly, I agree with Theodoret and Bishop Newton, who quotes him, that *the many* are put for the entire multitude of those who sleep, *i. e.* for *all*, just as Paul uses the word, Rom. v. 15, 19.

So far Mr. Gipps and I are agreed—but then it is plain from the prophecy that the shining of the wise as the firmament synchronizes with the restoration of the Jews; while all are agreed that the resurrection to shame will not take place until the dead small and great stand before the white throne, which is at least a thousand years afterwards.

I believe I have now left nothing important unnoticed in Mr. Gipps' second Chapter, with the exception of his comment on 2 Peter iii., for the rebutting of which I refer you to my own pamphlet on the subject; and with the exception also of his view of the kingdom as connected with 2 Tim. iv. 1, and 1 Cor. xv. 24—26. But these topics will afford ample materials for another letter, and therefore undismayed by your request for brevity, I postpone their consideration for the present.

LETTER IV.

THE KINGDOM.—Matt. xiii. 41; xvi. 18—Luke i. 33; xxii. 30—John xviii. 36—Eph. v. 5—Col. i. 13—2 Tim. iv. 18—Heb. i. 8.—2 Pet. i. 11, THE DELIVERING UP OF THE KINGDOM—1 Cor. xv. 23—26—Davidic rule over Enemies—The Tabernacle state of the New Heavens and New Earth—Ps. cx. xlvii.—First Fruits—The End—2 Tim. iv. 1.

I hope my tediousness will not oppress you, and that making all due allowance for my inability to compress my matter, you will now permit me to present you with some remarks on

THE KINGDOM.

Mr. Gipps writes thus: "the reader will find light by consulting the following passages, which are, I believe, all in the New Testament, in which the kingdom peculiarly his, is mentioned, Matt. xiii. 41; and xvi. 28; Luke i. 33; and xxii. 30; John xviii. 36; Eph. v. 5; Col. i. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 18; Heb. i. 8; 2 Pet. i. 11."—Let us then adopt this recommendation, and may light be vouchsafed to our understandings, while we examine these texts in order.

1.—At the end of the age or dispensation; all offenders, symbolized by the tares, shall be gathered out of *his* kingdom, by the messengers of the Son of Man, Matt. xiii. 41. But the kingdom, out of which they shall be then gathered, as we have already seen, corresponds with the world, (*kosmos*;) the world, therefore, must be the platform of his empire. Furthermore, —when the tares, being thus gathered, are cast into the furnace, "then shall the righteous shine forth as the Sun, in the kingdom of their Father," (ver. 43.) But the kingdom of their Father, for the coming of which we pray daily, is connected with the time when his will shall be done *on earth*, as it is in heaven. It must, therefore, be a kingdom, of which the visible administrator, as will hereafter be seen, shall be the Son of Man.

2.—The kingdom of the Son of Man, in which he was to be seen *coming*, by some of his disciples, before they tasted death, we have already discovered, from the testimony of one of those favoured individuals, to be that of the final establishment, whereof the pledge was given on the mount of transfiguration, when he appeared to them in that very glory, where-with he shall hereafter take possession of his father David's throne, comp. Matt. xvi. 28, with 2 Pet. i. 16—18. That he shall indeed reign upon that throne, is abundantly confirmed unto us, by the next place to which we are referred.

3.—Thus did the angel prophecy to Mary, at the salutation, concerning Jesus;—"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for the ages, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 32, 33. For my part I cannot understand, how men can so fritter away this promise, as to make it affirmatory of any thing rather than what it directly, *totidem verbis*, ensures to the Virgin's son. He shall succeed to David's throne, and rule the house of Jacob for the ages, says the angel; he shall neither succeed to the one, nor rule the other, the anti-millenarians, with one consentient voice, exclaim. Having all pre-deter-

mined this, they, one and all, draw to the utmost extent on their imaginations, to force some ingenious construction on the words, which they were never designed to convey. They talk of his reigning in the heart, which David never did; of his ruling the spiritual Jacob, and of his being head of the church, as David was of the state, though in this case his throne would be altogether diverse from that of David, &c. &c.* The general resort, however, is a quibble. Of whatever materials the actual throne, upon which David sat, was composed, it must long since have been destroyed, and it must now be impossible for Jesus to take his seat on it. But when history relates that some successful general or barbarian prince ascended the throne of the Cæsars, does she not mean to inform us by this well defined phraseology, that the adventurer in question had succeeded to the rank, style, dignity, honour, and power of Cæsar? And wherefore must Scripture be treated as no man would venture to treat any profane record? The rank and power of David, as king of Israel, was delegated to him by Jehovah, in whose name he reigned in Jerusalem. Just that rank and power is secured by oath and promise to Messiah, 1 Chron. xvii. 12—14, where Jehovah promises that the throne shall be established for him for the ages; and that he shall be established in Jehovah's kingdom and house for the ages: while David (ver. 17) gratefully acknowledges that his house was thus spoken of for a great while to come; and that he was mercifully regarded *according to the order of* THE ADAM THAT IS FUTURE. But refer, in corroboration hereof, to Isa. ix. 6, 7; Jer. xxiii. 5—xxxiii. 12—26; Amos ix. 11; Acts ii. 30. In this last place, indeed, the promise is referred to in proof of the resurrection. David being a prophet, foresaw that the resurrection must take place in order that the promise of sitting upon his throne might be fulfilled to Messiah. Cut off as the Man of Sorrows, it was manifest he could not reign in Jerusalem amongst his ancients gloriously before his death, and that he must therefore rise in order that he should do so. Has he done so yet? Assuredly not. It is not to David's throne he ascended, for David never ascended or reigned there, John iii. 13; Acts iii. 34. He ascended, on the contrary, to the Father's throne, Rev. iii. 21. And as he has sat down thereon, so shall he cause all who overcome to sit down with himself on his own throne, when that throne shall be established in righteousness. He is now exercising with the Father, just the same authority which the Father exercised, and which he exercised when David reigned in Mount Zion. But the authority which he is to exercise, according to the oath of the Fa-

* See my article on David's throne, Christian Examiner, Vol. x. 17.

ther, is a delegated authority, as **THE FRUIT OF DAVID'S LOINS ACCORDING TO THE FLESH**, just such as David exercised as the anointed one of the Father, as the man after God's own heart, Acts ii. 30. But the Davidic kingdom is to be brought to a close, how then are we to interpret the words of the angel—"and of his kingdom there shall be no end?" These words admit of two interpretations. 1st.—Let us bear in mind the analogous language of Dan. vi. 26; vii. 14, and it will amount to the same thing with the statement, that his kingdom *shall not pass away*, as did the four great monarchies, or be *destroyed*, as they were. No other dynasty shall succeed his;—his sceptre shall neither be wrested from him by sedition, revolution, or conquest. But, 2ndly, the endless kingdom may have no reference to the occupancy of David's throne; and this I incline to believe. His reign, as the David in the midst of his enemies, shall merge in his reign, as the Solomon, in the midst of his willing friends; and his reign, as the Solomon, all having been accomplished that was designed by his vicegerency, shall merge in the now direct rule of the Father, who shall then be *all in all*. It is quite according to the prophetic usage, that events the most distant, should be thus brought together. Thus do we find his ignominious infancy united with his glorious reign, without any note of the long intervening period, in Isa. ix. 6, 7. In the last verse some words have been supplied. It should run, *his government is for increase*,* it shall increase. The perpetual increase of power distinctly corresponding with the various stages of authority already noticed; and the peace shall not end—"He shall ascend the throne of David." So Houbigant amends the passage, and he had no system to maintain.

4.—At the institution of the last supper, Jesus—having said, he would no more eat of the Passover, until it should be fulfilled in the kingdom of God; and that he would no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God should come—first points out the traitor, and then represses the vain ambition of the apostles for present greatness, by referring them to his own menial condition amongst them, as one that serveth, adding, "ye are they which have continued with me in my (trials) temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Luke xxii. 16, 18, 28, 30. The kingdom wherein the Passover shall be fulfilled by the deliverance of all the *actual heirs* from the mystic Egypt; the kingdom wherein the fruit of the vine shall be drank of *new*, by Messiah and his saints; the kingdom to which they are

* Propagabit late imperium,—Houbigant.

appointed; the kingdom wherein they shall eat and drink at Messiah's table; and the kingdom, finally, wherein the apostles shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, I take it for granted, must be the very same.—But on another occasion, Christ taught them to regard the *regeneration*, (*παλιγγενεσις*), as the period when they should thus sit on thrones.—“We have forsaken all, and followed thee,” they said, after he had observed on the conduct of the rich youth, who went away from him sorrowful, “what shall we have therefore? and Jesus said to them, verily I say unto you, that ye, which have followed me, shall, in the Palingenesia, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his own, *αυτου*, glory, also sit on the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, Mat. xix. 27, 28. The *regeneration*, when all this shall come to pass, can only refer to that period when he that sitteth *on the throne* shall say, “behold I make all things new,” Rev. xxi. 5. But in that day, “the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people,” ver. 3. Further, that day is identified with the hour when the Son of Man shall sit “on the throne of his own glory,” even when he shall come in the glory of his Father, with his own holy ones, his messengers.—Apostles are not the only individuals who shall partake of his felicity, or who shall eat and drink with him.—For he hath said, “every one that hath forsaken houses or brethren, or sister or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit eternal life,” Mat. xix. 29. “Again, many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. The marriage supper of the Lamb, shall not be restricted to the few, who attended Jesus in his day of sorrow—it shall be participated in by all, who have had fellowship with him in his sufferings, and have been made conformable to his death.—As the apostles shall then sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, so shall the saints also judge the world, 1 Cor. vi. 2. They that overcome, shall sit on Messiah's throne, Rev. iii. 21. “He that overcometh, shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son,” Rev. xxi. 7. They shall inherit all things, by virtue of their union with the Son, who is *heir of all things*, Heb. i. 2, who is himself the conqueror, and through whom they are more than conquerors. But something may be necessary to be said on the word *judge*—the apostles shall *judge the twelve tribes of Israel*—the *saints shall judge the world*. In speaking of the judgment, and of the Judge of the quick and the dead, the notion, in general, is restricted to the idea of pronouncing a sentence, either of

acquittal or condemnation, on those who shall simultaneously be arraigned before the bar of justice.—But this is a mere popular error.—The judge, who, with us acts in the name, and on the behalf of the king, has to decide civil, as well as criminal causes.—He exercises, in fact, a portion of the kingly office, as the king's deputy in all legal matters, to facilitate the dispatch of justice, no monarch being capable of fulfilling, in his own person, all the multifarious offices, which it belongs to him of right to discharge.—In like manner, He, who of old, vouchsafed to be Israel's king, did, in condescension to Israel's weakness, appoint judges to *sit in the gate*, deciding cases; and still further, to exercise other legal functions, as generalissimos of his armies. It is in allusion to these extensive judicial functions, appertaining to vice-royalty, that he, who is followed by the armies of heaven on white horses, and who is to possess the gate of his enemies, is styled the Judge of the quick and the dead; and that they who are his, at his coming, are said also to judge the world.—Further the admirers of Mr. Gipps' mode of reasoning, must naturally be struck with the coincidence between the assurance above given, that the apostles are to *sit on thrones*, and the annunciation concerning the *first resurrection* which John makes, Rev. xx. 4. "I saw thrones and they sat upon them." Though an error may arise in tracing the similitude between various statements of wrath to befall the ungodly hereafter, as those statements may synchronize either with the execution of vengeance on the nations, in the valley of decision, or with the great assize or judicial transaction before the great white throne, where the dead small and great shall stand arraigned before him, who sitteth thereon; yet no such mistake can arise here, for we know of but one period when the thrones shall be set, when crowns of righteousness shall be awarded, when the saints shall possess the kingdom under the whole heaven, when the various cities shall be placed under their jurisdiction, and when they shall enter into the joy of their Lord.

5.—We now come to Christ's reply to Pilate. *My kingdom is not of this world*, is not derived from it, *if my kingdom were, ex, out of this world*, that is were world-derived, *then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but my kingdom is not (νυν) now, (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) henceforward, (ex eo tempore) or here, (hic) that is, in the world*, John xviii. 36. From this place we learn, that the Messiah's kingdom was not to be WORLD-DERIVED. It is to be given directly by the Father, and to be based on the ruins of every earthly dynasty. It was not to be set up at that time. There is a time to come, *viz.* the Palingenesia, commencing in the restitution of all things, it when shall

thenceforward be set up here. Such is the direct, plain, natural import of the place before us. Were this the only passage in the Bible bearing on the subject, I would here take my stand, and assert, that Christ must yet be king over all the earth. A writer in the *Christian Examiner*, Vol. x. p. 505, has endeavoured with much subtlety to give this text another turn. He argues that as Pilate's question, "art thou the King of the Jews," had reference to the time then being, our Lord's reply must necessarily be restricted to the same time, when he said, "thou sayest that I am—a king. To this end was I born; and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth." He here affirms first, that he was born to be a king; and secondly, that he came into the world to bear testimony to the truth, evidently of his own kingship, but not to exercise the royal functions. Now has it never been heard that men were born to be kings, who yet never ascended the throne till a very advanced period of life? Jesus was indeed king of the Jews, when he stood before Pilate and suffered upon the cross. He was not acknowledged as king, his subjects were in rebellion against him, and he attempted not to exercise one act of authority as their legitimate monarch. Far be it from me, by an act of "high treason, to un-king him now by denying to him that title, to which he made a rightful claim;" when he said, "thou sayest that I am—a king." But I do say he only claimed the title—he neither assumed nor exercised the office—"When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone." John vi. 15. It is no answer to say that he claimed "the name and essence of kingship" when he affirmed "all power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." Does he exercise this delegated power? Has he bound Satan? Is the usurpation at an end? Do the Jews own and obey him? Have they yet welcomed him saying, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord?" Has the oppression of the Gentiles ceased? Has he received the Heathen for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession? He occupies a throne indeed, but it is the throne of the Father, Rev. iii. 21. On David's throne, as King of the Jews, he does not sit, neither has he sat; and to all his other crowns the crown of all the earth has not been added. Two arguments have been drawn from John xviii. 36, to prove that Messiah's kingdom is what some please to call spiritual. 1. *His kingdom is not of this world*, which is interpreted by reference to John viii. 23, that as he himself was *not of this world*, but spiritual and heavenly, and not earthly like the Jews, so likewise his kingdom is not

earthly but spiritual. This seems to me to be a very inappropriate reference for an antimillenarian to rely on, unless, indeed, it be determined to deny his humanity in order to maintain a desperate hypothesis. Jesus was not world-derived, but was he therefore not a man? He was *from above* and he was supernaturally conceived in the Virgin's womb; but was he therefore *not flesh and blood*? Was the body that was prepared for him *immaterial*? Methought he was "Man of the substance of his mother, born in the world!" Was he not Abraham's seed, and sprang he not from David's loins? Now just as he, though he had an earthly body, in all respects like unto that belonging to the brethren, sin only excepted, was nevertheless, not world-derived, but the Lord from heaven: so, likewise, is his kingdom not world-derived, and yet is it the Lordship of earth; soon shall the cry be heard, "the worldly kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ, is come," Rev. xi. 15. (see Griesback's text.) 2.—It is urged, that because his servants did not fight for his deliverance, his kingdom could not be "literal and worldly;" that, if it had been so they would have been "seen to fight." Had his kingdom been world-derived, the sword had indeed been resorted to, by his supporters, in proper flesh and blood subsisting, to prevent his crucifixion. Then had his *under-rowers*, *υπηρεται*, his assistants, embarked with him in the same vessel, made way for him, through blood, to the throne of Jerusalem; and, instead of a crown of thorns, they had adorned his brow with the diadem of Solomon. But in stating this did he, who avowed himself, the rightful king of the Jews, affirm that he would never claim the sceptre hereafter, and would never make his title good by the agency of other under-rowers or servants? In saying that his kingdom was not *now* to be *henceforward*, or his under-rowers would fight, did he not in effect assert that the time would come, when his kingdom, though not of the world derived, should yet in the world be established, and that too by a most fearful conflict, in which his under-rowers shall fight, (see Ps. cxlix. 5—9. Joel ii. 3—11. Mal. iv. 3. Alas! the day of the Lord, in the valley of decision is near. That the disciples did thus understand our Lord to intimate that he would, at some future period, claim his seat on David's throne, and that too after he had been, for forty days subsequent to his resurrection, instructing them in *the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*, appears from the question they put to him—*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore, (αποκαθισταναι,) re-establish, the kingdom to Israel?* In this question I apprehend there is an allusion to the unfulfilled vision of the valley of dry bones; and the predicted revival and restoration of the two houses of

Israel; and the symbolical union of the two sticks of the Prophet. For I find that portion of prophecy thus commented on, by Jehovah. "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, I will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land, and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and *one king shall be king to them all—David*, my servant, shall be king over them; and *they shall have one Shepherd*, (a passage which greatly corroborates our view of the judgment of the Sheep and Goats,)—and they shall dwell in the land, which I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children, and their childrens' children, for ever: and *my servant David shall be their prince for ever*, (or for the ages)—my tabernacle shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people, and the heathen shall know that I, the Lord, do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore." Ezek. xxxvii. 21—28. Whether this prediction were in the view of the apostles or not, however, when they put the above question to their adorable master, it is quite obvious, that it abundantly justified their expectation, that he would thus establish the kingdom; become Israel's prince for the ages; dwell in the midst of them, as thus located in their own land; place his tabernacle abidingly amongst them, which it never has been at all since the Babylonish captivity; and thereby cause THE HEATHEN to know Jehovah, as Israel's sanctifier. Their master's reply did not, in the remotest degree, curb this expectation, but, on the contrary, confirmed it. They take for granted, that such a *re-establishment* must take place, and they enquire is it to take place at this time. But, being unwilling to afford them any information, as to the time, he rejoins, that it was not for them "to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath placed under his own control," Acts i. 6, 7. It is particularly worthy of note that Peter after he had received the Holy Ghost and healed the lame man at the Temple gate, pressed the doctrine of repentance on the Jews, saying that the Lord "shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of re-establishing, ἀπικαταστάσις, (the substantive form of that unusual expression, which was employed in the enquiry that was made of Christ concerning the time when he would re-establish Israel's kingdom;) of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy Prophets since the world began, or from the age," Acts iii. 21. comp. Rom. viii. 19—23. Rev. v. 9—13. Every one of the Prophets have, I undertake to

prove to you, spoken of these times, as connected with Israel's recovery, and the second advent. As for instance, Obadiah, who makes not the most remote mention of the first advent, or of what is called the Gospel kingdom, yet speaks of these times as setting in with the day of the Lord on the heathen, with deliverance and holiness on Mount Zion, with the destruction of enemies, and with the re-possession of Canaan by Israel—concluding his prediction thus:—"Saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the Mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." Obad. 15—21. But to return; I now repeat what I once before wrote, though it was met with a sneer by a writer in the *Christian Examiner*; Christ "could only then, according to the divine purpose, bear testimony to his rightful sovereignty, but that testimony is infinitely important. His kingdom, he informed Pilate, was not of this, *κοσμος*, (*kosmos* world) not of the earth in its present attire, for now i. e., at this time, his kingdom is not from hence." The veriest tyro knows, that the word, *κοσμος*, primarily signifies ornament or order, and that when applied to earth it denotes its ornamental garniture. When Christ, therefore, says his kingdom is not of this, *κοσμος*, he conveys to us the idea, that his kingdom is in no wise derived from earth in her thistly habiliments, disorganized throughout, and presenting in her aspect none of that regular symmetry, for which she was distinguished, when she came forth from the hands of her great Creator.

6.—We learn, that, no whoremongers, unclean persons, nor the covetous, who are idolators, "have any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God," Eph. v. 5. The passage itself does not convey any direct intimation of what the kingdom is. But as it is stated to be a *kingdom*, upon which we are to enter by *inheritance*, we have some clue as to its nature. We meet with several notices of the inheritance in this epistle. They who have believed in Christ, and have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, have IN him also *obtained an inheritance*," Chap. i. 11.—Now if we look back to Rom. viii. 15—21, we shall find it said, concerning the children of God, who are "joint heirs with Christ," that their present sufferings can be nothing, when compared with the GLORY to be *revealed* IN them, because the whole burdened creation, with outstretched neck, awaiteth *the manifestation of the Sons of God*, as the epoch when deliverance, not destruction, observe, awaiteth it. If the mere manifestation of the Sons of God to the creation, shall bring down such a blessing *upon* creation, what blessedness, what glory, what recompense for suffering must be in reserve for the corporate heirship! Again, they

are said to be "sealed with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession." Chap. i. 13, 14. Recurring again to Romans, viii. we find it likewise affirmed of the heirs, "ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God; and, if children, then, heirs," &c. But further, they who are sealed with the spirit, receive their inheritance on the redemption of the purchased possession. What is this possession that is purchased? It cannot be heaven, for heaven needeth not redemption;—it never was defiled with sin; it never was afflicted with misery; and, to speak of its redemption, or deliverance from evil, would be absurd in the extreme. It must, therefore, mean either the church or the world, or both; now *both* are *redeemed*, and *both* shall be *delivered*. "The creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, we are expressly taught in Rom. viii.; and the same all-instructive passage tells us,—“not they, only, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of the body*.” It is a very common error to speak of heaven as bought for the church. This stands upon no foundation of Scripture. That which has been bought, or ransomed, or delivered, is that, which is in the power of the enemy, and it has been bought for Jesus. "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price, the precious blood of Jesus." That blood literally fell on and besprinkled the material, in token that it too shall be delivered, and its curse removed. In another passage, I find Paul describing the long concealed mystery to be, "that the Gentiles should be *fellow heirs*, and of the same body and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel," Eph. iii., not the mere vocation of the Gentiles, as is sometimes stated, but the actual, joint participation in the promised inheritance of believing Gentiles, with those of the circumcision in the flesh, who are also circumcised in heart. The inheritance promised to Israel is Canaan, and by incorporation into the same body with Israel, by being engrafted into the same olive and partaking of the same *seed*, to whom the promise was made, the Gentiles acquired an equal right to Canaan with the Jews, and shall with Jesus, the seed of Abraham, enter on its actual occupation. This mystery is more fully unfolded, Col. i. 27, as "made manifest to the saints, to whom God would make known," but Oh! what slow and stupid scholars we are, *what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is CHRIST IN YOU, THE HOPE OF GLORY*—Christ in you! but is not Christ the heir? Yea, and of him is

it expressly written, "Yet will I bring an Heir unto thee, O inhabitant of Mareshah (*or the inheritance*); He, *the glory of Israel*, shall come to Adullam," which Burkius with Hillery understands and translates, *at the perpetuity of the yoke*, when it seems irrevocable, when all things appear to insure its continuance.—When the Heir, in all the lowliness of despised manhood, first came to demand the fruit of his vineyard, the cry was raised "this is the heir, come let us kill him and the inheritance shall be our's." Matt. xxi. 38. The evil purpose prevailed, but the husbandmen were fearfully requited.—They fell on the choice corner stone and were broken. Then was it that the yoke was truly placed upon their pecks. But when he cometh in his glory, and grindeth to powder the ungodly upon whom he shall fall, then shall the yoke, once deemed perpetual, and *that* by men who, ought to have been better instructed, fall from their shoulders; and from the condition of bondslaves they shall be raised to the rank of Princes in all lands.—And shall the Heir, the Glory of Israel, be brought to his inheritance? Then, verily, they, who are joint-heirs with him, must also be brought into possession, and enter upon the kingdom; but *no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolator*, shall have *any inheritance* with them *in the kingdom of Christ and of God*. Now, in the context of this chapter, the heirs of this kingdom are further described as formed into that spousal body, of which Jesus is the husband, as being the Bride, the Lamb's wife, Eph. v. 23—33. But at the juncture, when "the marriage of the Lamb is come and his wife hath made herself ready," Rev. xix. 7, then goeth he forth on the white horse, accompanied by his joint-heirs, to smite the nations, rule them with a rod of iron, cast the beastial body into the lake of fire, bind Satan, and establish the thrones, on which his joint-heirs—the armies that followed him to the carnage—the Bride herself, shall live and reign with him the thousand years, Rev. xix. 11—21; xx. 1—4. No doubt can exist as to the identity of the Warrior Horsemen and the Bride.—*To her was granted*, as her special prerogative, as the fitting robe of state for the queen consort of the Lamb, *that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of Saints*. But the warrior horsemen are similarly apparelled—"the armies, which were in heaven, followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean." The royal vesture belongeth only to the Bride. She accompanies him therefore to his final conquest, and shall she be excluded from his throne? Assuredly not. But he commences his reign at the final conquest, after treading the winepress, and binding Satan, that is at the first resurrection; and there-

fore the kingdom of Christ and of God, in which she has her inheritance, is that, which is established during the thousand years or upwards, which precede the judgment before the white throne. We meet with a passage every way similar to Eph. v. 5, in Gal. v. 21, "they which do such things (the works of the flesh) shall not inherit the kingdom of God," but in contrast with these, they who bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, who ARE CHRIST'S and have *crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts*, are brought before us—and they must needs therefore be the inheritors of the kingdom. The expression *who are Christ's*, must be well noted.—It occurs before chap. iii. 29. IF YE BE CHRIST'S THEN ARE YE ABRAHAM'S SEED, AND HEIRS ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE. What promise? Verily, the promise of Canaan to Abraham, as the heir of the world, and to his seed, which he referred to ver. 16. (comp. Gen. xii. 7.; xiii. 15; xv. 18.) in proof that the inheritance is not of the law but of promise.* So that, as he afterwards writes, *now, we, brethren, (αγαπῶντες) according to, or in like manner with Isaac, are the children of promise.* Gal. iv. 28.

7.—Intimately connected with the passage we have just examined, is that, which next presents itself.—I must quote the preceding verse along with it. "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the," (ἐξουσίας,) authority or "control of the darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love," Col. i. 12, 13. Their adaptation to the *inheritance*, as connected with their present deliverance from the control of evil, and their change of condition from the degradation of slavery to the honourable estate of the kingship, is here the subject of thanksgiving.—The inheritance we have already enlarged on, and have found it to be an inheritance in the yet future kingdom of Christ and of God.—But the kingdom, into which they are here said to be brought, is something different; and being put in contrast with the slavery, out of which they are delivered, can only denote the state of regal dignity into which, as a nation of kings, the POLYGARCHY of Jesus, with whom they are associated in his throne, they have, through much abounding grace, been brought.—Thus are we said in the same sense to be brought "unto the Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of messengers, to the general assembly and church of the first-born," Heb. xii. 22, 23. The *heavenly Jerusalem*, unto which we are brought, and which is hereafter to come down

* See Christian Herald, vol. iv. page 153, on the Promise of Canaan to the Seed.

from God out of heaven, is an expression which duly weighed, may throw much light upon our inquiry. The word, (επουρανισμῶς,) heavenly, here applied to the New Jerusalem, is the very word used in Ephesians, to describe the place, to which the faithful are exalted, though it is also used to denote the place in which Satan and his subordinate powers now exercise their authority.—The one are blessed with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies, (επουρανισμῶς,) Eph. i. 3.—they “are raised up together and made to sit together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus,” Eph. ii. 6, and yet are they called on to “wrestle against the rulers of the darkness of this age,” dispensation or economy, “against the spirituals of the wickedness in the heavenlies,” Eph. vi. 12. Those rulers, those spirituals are now in the possession, and yet, by reason of the certainty of their ejection; by reason of the fact, that a greater one is in the church, than he that is in the world; and by reason of the certainty of the fact, that there is a present enjoyment, of the power of the world to come, experienced by the heirs of the inheritance; they are already said to be located and blessed in the heavenlies. Just, in the same way, are they also said to be arrived at Jerusalem, the heavenly, and to be translated into the kingdom of the Son of God’s love.

8.—That some such meaning ought to be ascribed to the passage referred to, will appear, I think; from the next place, to which I will draw your attention, for I pass over the next, in order, as it forms the subject of a separate investigation.—*The Lord*, who stood by Paul at his first answer, when all others forsook him, he writes to Timothy, “shall deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his kingdom, the heavenly,” (τὴν επουρανιον,) 2 Tim. iv. 18. His deliverance from every evil work is here opposed to, as it is also connected with his being saved unto the kingdom, the heavenly; just as the deliverance from the control of darkness is opposed to the translation into the kingdom of the Son of God’s love, in the former passage:—In the one, the present power—in the other, the full experience of the blessing, is spoken of. It is the more remarkable in the latter case, not only from the certainty, with which the yet unrealized issue is contemplated, a certainty which in Scripture language, would fully warrant its being described in the light of a present enjoyment; but also from his previously stated conviction, that the crown of righteousness shall be given to him, and all that love the Lord’s appearing in *that day*, v. 8, to which we need now add nothing further after our former comment.

9.—*But unto the Son, he saith*, “Thy throne, O God, is for the age of the age, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of

thy kingdom." Heb. i. 8. These words are quoted from the *Song of Loves*, Ps. xlv. 6, in proof of Messiah's pre-eminent dignity. Now examine the context where they are originally found.—The comeliness of Jesus being described, he is invoked, as the Mighty One, to gird on his sword—his right hand, it is affirmed, shall teach him terrible things;—and then, it is added, "Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies—the peoples fall under thee."—Does not this prediction directly correspond with the destruction by fire and sword of all flesh, Isa. lxvi. 16, and with the destruction of the beasts, Rev. ix. 17—21! Immediately following this announcement of discomfiture, the words before us are inscribed, "Thy throne, O God, is for the age of the age; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." His own grace and dignity being further noticed, the appearance of the Queen, the Lamb's wife, at his right hand, in all the royal splendour, is dilated on through the remainder of the Psalm. The facts here predicted, and the order of the events, precisely correspond with the prophecy of Dan. vii. and of Rev. xix., enemies are destroyed by the enthroned Son, and with him, in the greatness of his triumph, and in the glory of his kingdom, is associated the Church of the First-born, whose names are written in heaven. But the kingdom, in the glory of which, she is associated with him is, in the words of Daniel, "the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven; for Tyre's Daughter gifts her, the rich among the people entreat her favour, and, becoming now a fruitful mother, she makes her children princes in all the earth. Great light indeed does this place throw upon the kingdom. One remark more before we pass on—as the events described synchronize with those of Rev. xix. the setting up of this kingdom must correspond with the establishment of the thrones and the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 4; and must therefore precede the judgment before the White Throne, by at least one thousand years.

10.—They who with all diligence practise the duties of the Christian calling, Peter affirms *shall never fall*. For so, he adds, an entrance *shall be ministered to you abundantly into the age-belonging or age-enduring in the millennial kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, 2 Pet. i. 11. Wherefore he determines not to be negligent in reminding them of these things, seeing he had followed no cunningly devised fable, but was an *eye-witness of his majesty* on the holy mount, 12–18. From the determination he thus comes to, it is manifest that the age-belonging kingdom is the same with that, of which the transfiguration was both the type and pledge, as we have already

seen. But that kingdom is the kingdom of the Coming One, who shall return by the same trackway, that he once ascended into heaven. The age-belonging kingdom, into which an entrance shall abundantly be ministered to the called and chosen, is that which shall be established, when Jesus thus returns to claim the kingdoms for his own, and to take his long-promised station upon the throne of his Father David.

THE DELIVERING UP OF THE KINGDOM.

Great importance has very deservedly been attached, in this controversy, to 1 Cor. xv. 23—26. The kingdom which Christ will deliver up to the Father, I cordially agree with Mr. Gipps, “will not be delivered up at the end of the thousand years, described Rev. xx. 4; for “he will not deliver up the kingdom till all enemies are subdued,” v. 25. But the Holy Ghost after defining in three verses of Rev. xx. (3, 5, 7,) the ending of the thousand years, informs us that enemies remain, *after* that period is thus *ended*; for the Devil is to be loosed, and *the nations in the four quarters of the earth*, whose number is as the sand of the sea, are to be deceived by him, and to wage war against the Saints; and are to be subdued at the time when fire comes down from God, ver. 9. Therefore Christ must continue to retain *the kingdom during the whole of this succeeding period; and* consequently cannot have delivered it up at the end of the preceding period of the thousand years.”* I, for one, never supposed that the personal reign of Christ and his Saints on earth was to be limited to the term of the thousand years. That term is only employed to limit the first age of uninterrupted dominion, which the Saints shall enjoy with him, who is, (Βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων,) KING OF THE AGES, 1 Tim. i. 17; even the period of Satan’s confinement and of the Lord’s forbearance with the rest of the dead, whose judgment is postponed till after its close. Further, I fully agree with Mr. Gipps, that “we may perhaps receive light upon the subject of *the kingdom*, by referring to the nature of David’s kingdom, which is continually represented as typical of Christ’s, (Isa. ix. 6, 7; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Luke i. 32.) The kingdom of David was two-fold.”† One branch of it was over willing Israel; the other “over the enemies of Israel, the Edomites, Moabites, Philistines, &c., whom he subdued in battle, and over whom, though unwilling, he reigned by power.” We have already seen, that David’s kingdom was more than a type of Christ’s, for Christ shall actually sit upon the throne of David, succeed to him in the kingdom, be literally *king of the Jews*, and Ruler in Israel. We shall prove presently also, that he shall subdue the same nations to-

* Note R. p. 48. †Id. p. 49.

gether with all, who shall be confederate against Israel. In the "day of the Lord, which is near upon all the heathen," Obad. 15, we are expressly told that the Edomites are to be consumed, (v. 18,) and that the plain of the Philistines, and that of the Canaanites, and of the cities of the South are to be possessed by "the captivity of this host of the children of Israel." (ver. 19, 20.) The Moabites and Ammonites are expressly named, as amongst the discomfited by Israel, when marshalled under the root of Jesse, as the time of their final recovery. (Isa. xi. 14.) Joel mentions the desolation of Edom in the plain of Jehoshaphat, (iii. 19.) And (in Amos ix. 12,) we are told that the "remnant of Edom and of all the heathen upon whom Jehovah's name is called," shall be possessed in that very day, when the fallen Tabernacle of David shall be raised. Indeed it is said to be raised for this very purpose, that possession may be taken of them. But further IN THAT DAY, when he, who came forth unto Jehovah out of Bethlehem Ephratah, and *is to be RULER IN ISRAEL whose goings forth have been from of old from the days of eternity, or the ages, shall stand and feed in the strength of the LORD, IN THE MAJESTY OF THE NAME of the LORD his God, and he shall be great unto the ends of the earth;* and when THE REMNANT OF HIS BRETHREN shall return unto the children of Israel, from whom they have long been dissevered, even since they were led captive of Shalmanezzer;—then will he utterly destroy all the instruments of idolatry, and oppression, and execute vengeance in anger and fury upon the heathen. (Mic. v. 2—15.) Thus, then, shall Messiah discomfit and subdue and take possession of the territories of the same identical enemies of Israel, and of the heathen round about, as David did; and shall re-erect David's Tabernacle with the very view of taking them in possession. So shall he *rule in the midst of his enemies.* The Davidic-reign shall then commence. Then shall obedience by the rod of iron be enforced. This circumstance accounts for the fact, that when the bonds, which ruled them, are relaxed, and Satan let loose again, they readily fall into his snares, become the victims of his delusion, and suffer him to lead them up *against the camp of the Saints,* and the BELOVED CITY, (Rev. xx. 7—9.) It is not till after this crisis that the Solomon-reign shall commence. The Davidic-reign is not designed to be permanent, but is to merge in the Solomon. Amongst other reasons, I draw this conclusion from the form of expression employed above, the promised re-erection of David's *Tabernacle.* A tabernacle is a temporary and moveable dwelling. Every thing in David's history marks the condition of a newly established, though powerful monarchy. Conquest after conquest leads to

the extension of his power. He neither builds a palace for himself and his successors, nor is he permitted to erect a temple for Jehovah. All this was reserved for Solomon. I find a similar distinction observed in the vision of the new earth and the new heavens. *The camp of the Saints*, which Gog and Magog made a vain effort to invest, being deluded by some lying artifice of the Father of lies, could only have been a temporary and moveable provision for their accommodation; but we shall afterwards find them in occupation of a permanent and glorious city. When John first beholds, in the distance, the Holy City, he beholds it accordingly, not as actually descended, but descending; and a voice informs him, "Behold the *Tabernacle of God* is with men," Rev. xxi. 2, 3. It was then the *descending* city, just as Jesus is now the *coming* King. From hence the saints could go, to and fro, and place their camp wheresoever they listed; and while this is the case, while the city is only descending, the *tabernacle of God*, and not the *temple*, is established amongst men. But in the second vision, with which John was favoured, of the descending city, not in the distance, but nigh at hand, for he is carried away in the spirit to the summit of a lofty mountain, from which he may obtain a nearer prospect, (ver. 10—26,) he gains an accurate acquaintance with its whole structure, its dimensions, and materials. He hears nothing now of the tabernacle of God being with men, but he finds that the city possesses the very glory of God; and while he sees *no temple therein*, of material form, yet is he careful to assign the reason, *for the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, ARE THE TEMPLE OF IT*. And so resplendent is the glory of the Lord in the midst of it, that sun and moon are not needed; and now doth he discern it, with prophetic eye, in actual contact with earth, for he writeth, "the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it; and *the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it*; yea, they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations," as well as of their monarchs, "into it." The city now assumes the aspect of the temple and supercedes the tabernacle. You will thus perceive that I consider the vision of the New Heavens to embrace both the Davidic and Solomon reign, both the Tabernacle and Temple state of Messiah's kingdom. I know the objection that is made to the idea that the thousand years are included within the period of the dispensation of the New Heavens, from the statement that *there was no more sea*, after the first earth and heaven had passed away; and that yet *the sea gave up the dead, which were in it* when the judgment took place before the white throne after the thousand years were ended. But I beg it to be observed,

1. That the words, "and I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away. And there was no more sea," (Rev. xxi. 1,) form a separate and independent vision expressive of the final modification that ensues, the whole dispensation at one glance passing before him: and is no more necessarily affirmative that the sea ceased at once to be, when the new dispensation commenced, than the prophecy of Micah iv. is necessarily affirmative that He, who came out of Bethlehem Ephratah, did at his coming out thereof become Ruler in Israel, become great unto the ends of the earth, and execute the vengeance written.

2. I am also aware that the passing away of the first heaven and earth is said to have taken place when the Judge taketh his station upon the white throne, because it is said concerning him, that from his "face the earth and the heaven fled away;" but while this is predicated of him, it is not said that they flee away from his face *when* he taketh his station upon the white throne, but on the contrary they are said to *have fled* away from his face—but his face was disclosed to their view at the destruction of the beast, for then every eye saw him, before the thousand years commenced, and I therefore argue that the heavens and the earth had passed away at least a thousand years before, even at the time when he looked out upon the earth from the cloud of his glory. It is only spoken of as a note of identity to distinguish him, just as the fact of his riding upon an ass is parenthetically introduced to identify the king of Israel, who cuts off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem and whose dominion extendeth from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth, Zech. ix. 9, 10, with the lowly Jesus of Nazareth. From not noticing this prophetic mode of writing, we are often in danger of falling into a similar error with the Jews, who were unable to see the fulfilment of any prophecies in the Messiah, because all that was said of him did not come to pass in the term of his natural life.

3.—Unless the new heaven and new earth were identical with the orb we inhabit and its atmosphere, it could never be said there was *no more* sea—that it was *no more*, or *no longer*, implies that it *had been before*. The new heavens and new earth must therefore be a modification or altered state of the first heavens and the first earth.

But much stress has been laid upon the absolute destruction of the enemies, whose entire subjugation is to lead to the surrender of the kingdom to the Father. Christ is to *put down* or *destroy* every principality, and the last enemy he is to put down or *destroy* is death. The word, *καταργα*, *put down*, implies something different to destruction. Scapula defines it, "*reddo*

ἀεργον, et inefficacem, facio cessare ab operi, tollo, aboleo.” It signifies, in this place, the depriving enemies of all evil energy, the entire paralysis of all hostility, the cessation of enmity, the abolishing of strife, the reduction of death to a powerless and inoperative condition. With regard to himself, Christ did thus deprive him of power and abolished death, (2 Tim. i. 10) when he arose from the sepulchre; and so also, as it concerned himself, did he render powerless, or deprive of energy, paralyse, destroy not only death, but him also that had the power of death, that is the Devil, (Heb. ii. 15) and more than this—he did thus virtually abolish, enervate, paralyse, and deprive them of all energy, as it regards every object of redemption—When full effect is given to his work, then will death and Satan lose all activity, and cease to exercise any influence or authority.—But this will not be the case till after the Davidic reign has closed.—This result is posterior to the judgment before the great white throne—while enemies remain, whatever restraint may be imposed upon their enmity, either by exterior force, such as the rod of iron, or judicially, the kingdom will not be surrendered to the Father. It is obvious, that these enemies are *now* rampant.—The Devil is going about as a roaring lion, *unchained*.—He is still in full and undeniable possession of his usurpation as god of this world, and prince of the power of the air. The whole world lieth in him.—Death, spiritual, is dominant. Death and the grave are daily slaying their millions. Christ, indeed, made a *shew of them all, triumphing over them, in himself*, *ἐν αὐτῷ*, (and thus margin,) at his ascension, (Col. ii. 15.) when he led captivity captive; and before that hour, he saw Satan as lightning fall from heaven, when the unclean spirits being cast out by his disciples, proof was afforded of the mighty potency, which is lodged in the heirs of the kingdom, and shall ultimately be put forth for the entire subversion of all evil; but it was only a shew he then made of the adversaries, and it was but in vision, and in earnest of his ultimate ejection, he beheld the fall of Satan from heaven. There we still find him lodged, for it is against him and his wretched coadjutors, as in the occupation of the heavenlies, (Eph. vi. 12.) we are called on to wrestle. Till the time comes for casting them out, he will continue to sit at the right hand of the Father, (Ps. cx. 1.) ’Tis somewhat strange, after Mr. Gipps’ admission, that the subjugation of enemies is future; that they are not in fact made Messiah’s footstool; he should, nevertheless, argue from this psalm, that they are his footstool; that his session, at the Father’s right hand, is equivalent to his rule in the midst of them; that “at his ascension, he was invested with *this kingdom* over all prin-

cialties and powers," (Eph. i. 20, 21; 1 Pet. iii. 22;) and that it is this kingdom which, upon the final extirpation of the enemies, he is to deliver up. He, indeed, afterwards somewhat more cautiously expresses himself, when he speaks of the "ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY over all enemies," which belongeth unto the Son of Man.—Such an authority does truly belong to him—all power is given to him.—It has been granted to him to sit down on the Father's throne; but his own throne, on which his fellow victors are to sit along with him, he occupies not as yet.—His session on the right hand of the Father is antecedent to his rule, and must not be confounded with it. "Sit thou at my right hand," was the address to him at the ascension, and is expressive of his present dignity and position.—"The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion, rule thou &c." is a prospective promise descriptive of his future reign.—His elevation to the right hand of the Father was fulfilled at the ascension, (Acts ii. 32–36;) but his position there is one of expectation, where he patiently awaiteth the hour, when he shall receive the kingdom over enemies, by constituting them his footstool, (Heb. x. 12, 13.) If Paul (in Eph. ii. 20–22,) speaks of him at *the right hand* as advanced above all principality, and as having acquired a name above every name, so that virtually and in purpose all things are put under his feet as the Church's head; and if another Apostle speaks of him as "on the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him" (1 Pet. iii. 22;) we must bear in mind the modifying statement of the inspired comment on the kindred prediction (of Ps. viii. 6.) "thou hast put all things under his feet," which we meet with, (Heb. ii. 8,) "But now we see not yet all things put under him;" and learn to interpret those places as we would Rom. viii. 30, where those who are *justified* are said to be *also glorified*, though they are only glorified in purpose, and shall not enter upon glory, till the Son of Man cometh in his kingdom. Very strangely I must say has Phil. ii. 7–11 been referred to in proof that, as a reward of his sufferings, he has already received the kingdom over principalities and powers. They are not even mentioned, nor is the kingdom—but the ultimate design of his exaltation, and of his acquisition of that name, which is above every name, is stated to be, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of the heavenlies, (επουρανιων,) of the earthlies, (επιγαιων,) and of the under-grounders, (καταχθονιων,) and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." But as Paul says of Ps. viii. 6, so say I of this statement of his, *we see not yet* all the heavenlies, the earthlies, and the under-grounders bowing the knee at Jesus' name, nor hear we all

tongues confessing him. For this blessed result we must wait patiently. It remains to be effected *when the TIMES of reanimation*, (*αἰχμαλωτισμὸς*;) shall come *from the presence of the Lord* (Acts iii. 19.) We must wait for it—for Jesus himself waiteth for it, sitting at the right hand of the Father, till his enemies are made his footstool. There must he continue to sit till the appointed hour cometh, for it is written of him, on his session there, “whom the heavens must receive (or contain) until the *times* of the *re-establishing* of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began,” (Acts iii. 21.) But, as a vast deal depends upon the view, which is taken of Psalm cx. I would draw your attention, before we proceed further, a little more minutely to it. The following is Horseley’s Version, followed by extracts from some of his notes:—

MESSIAH’S EXALTATION.

1. [Thus] spake Jehovah to my Lord,
“Sit thou on my right hand, till I make
Thine enemies thy foot-stool.”
2. The Sceptre of thy power Jehovah shall send abroad from Zion;
Have thou dominion in the very midst of thine enemies.
3. With thee shall be offerings of free will,
In the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness.
The dew of thy progeny is more than of the womb of the morning.
4. Jehovah hath bound himself by an oath, and will not repent;
Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedech.
5. The Lord, at thy right hand, O Jehovah,*
Woundeth kings in the day of his wrath.

ORACULAR VOICE.

6. He shall strive with the heathen, filling all with slaughter,
Wounding the head of mighty ones upon the earth.†
7. He shall drink of the brook beside the way
Therefore shall he lift up his head.

Ver. 3. “The ‘offerings of free will’ denote the spiritual worship of the Gospel”—“If our modern text gives the true reading, the expression is to be joined with ‘offerings of free will,’ as another phrase for the same thing, intimating that that spiritual devotion, which the Gospel requires, is alone worthy of God, and is the perfection of worship. But if the reading of the lxx. be adopted, as it is represented in the Alexandrine MSS. which seems to have been *בְּהַרְי קִישִׁיר* ‘the splendours of thy Saints,’ it is either a periphrasis for the Saints and Angels in heaven, who are thus described as joined with Christians upon earth in the offerings of free will; or the clause ‘in the splendours of thy saints,’ is a farther description of the time for those free-will offerings, intended, in the preceding clause, by ‘the day of thy power.’ After a

* COMMON VERSION.

The Lord at thy right hand
Shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.

† “Or, according to the modern reading, ‘wounding the head of a great country.’”

long examination of the kindred expression, Ps. xevi. 9, which is similarly connected with the bringing of a bread offering into his courts, by the heathen, all the earth being admonished to stand in awe of him, he adds, 'The divine Spirit looked forward to the institution of that universal worship, in which the only offering should be a mincha, commemorative of the one efficacious bloody sacrifice, offered once for all. And this is a further argument, that 'the beauties of holiness,' intended by the divine spirit, are to be looked for in that improved spiritual worship."

Ver. 5.—"In the first verse, the Lord is distinguished from Jehovah, and placed at his right hand. *It is difficult to believe*, that at so small a distance in the same Psalm, both the titles and the situations should be interchanged, viz., Jehovah called the Lord, and placed at the Lord's right hand. I am, therefore, *much inclined to indulge in a conjecture*, which Dr. Kennicott, too, seems to have entertained, that the word יהוה or אלהים hath been lost out of the text, after the word מִיָּמִינֶיךָ and should be restored!!!!"

Ver. 7. "The composition of this Psalm is admirable in the extatic style. The Psalmist begins gravely, relating in the first verse, an oracular promise of Jehovah to his Lord. Then, in the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses, he addresses his discourse to his Lord, upon the subject of that promise. In 5th verse, having before his imagination, the scene of his Lord's achievements in his state of exaltation, his admiration breaks out in words addressed to Jehovah. The 7th and 8th, I am much inclined to consider as the reply of 'an oracular voice to the astonished prophet.'"

This view of the structure of the Psalm, is, I believe, entirely correct, with the exception of the view of verse 5, which, as you will observe above, is founded on a conjectural emendation, unworthy, altogether, of his great critical powers. He found it "*difficult to believe*," that in "an ecstatic Psalm, at so small a distance," in prophetic writing, though not, observe, in prophetic time, "the titles and the situation should be interchanged;" hence, he says, he was "much inclined to indulge in a conjecture,"—the inclination is forthwith indulged—the conjecture is instantly expressed—the word *Jehovah* must have been lost out of the text;—it is inserted at once, as a vocative; and an address to the Son is straightway transmuted into an address to the Father. This is a very reprehensible mode of criticism; but it is one which has been very rarely adopted by this great man. However, he misunderstood Kennicott:—his sole remark on verse 5 was this,—"*I think the ancient versions read here יהוה*"—not meaning that the word *Jehovah* was inserted in these versions as a vocative, but that it occupied the place, which the word אֲדֹנִי, or Lord, does in our text. And so our translators manifestly thought also, for they have printed the word, LORD, in capitals, as if the original were Jehovah; and so the original is in many manuscripts. This emendation, however, does not vary the sense; Jehovah is Adoni, and Adoni is Jehovah. In Horsey's general outline I fully agree. —*First*, the exaltation of the ascended Adoni to the right hand of the Father: and the solemn promise that he should set there, till his enemies were to be made his foot-stool, is announced by the oracular voice. I say, until they are to be made his

foot-stool, or the period of subjugation arrives. This appears from the text *עַד אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה*, "till I shall cause to make," or place;—such is the force of the conjugation, Hiphil, which conveys the idea of causing another to do. That other, here, must be the Messiah himself, who is to sit at the right hand, and be retained in the heavens, till the Father shall cause him to make,—not has already made,—his enemies his footstool. Messiah shall be the Father's agent, and instrument, in accomplishing this very work for himself. But this appears further, from the *second* portion of the Psalm, which consists of a prophetic address to the exalted and ascended Adoni, sitting at the right hand of the Father, (ver. 2—5,) an address which is continued through the *third* portion, (v. 6, 7.) whether it is to be considered as an oracular response or not. 1st, Jehovah, it is predicted, shall send the sceptre of Messiah's power abroad from Zion. The prophet here takes up precisely the import of the oracular address, and ascribes the impelling power, by which Messiah's own sceptre shall be swayed, to the Father, who shall cause that sceptre to be sent abroad from Zion. Right fearful shall be the sweep of its vengeance. It shall dash to pieces, as a potter's vessel, the embattled hosts of Antichrist, Ps. ii. 9. 2ndly, In the very midst of his enemies, shall his dominion be established. The enemies here spoken of, must continue present, to admit of his thus ruling in the midst of them. He shall place his feet *upon their necks*, in partial fulfilment of the oracular promise, that his enemies shall be made his *foot-stool*. There are two ideas in Scripture, apparently attached to this form of expression:—one, *the actual extermination of enemies*. Thus was it when Joshua caused the five kings to be drawn forth from the cave, and addressed *the captains of the men of war, which went with him*, saying, "Come near, put your feet upon the necks of these kings. And they came near and put their feet upon the necks of them." This was altogether a symbolical action. The confederacy of the kings, which was formed against Israel, was thus broken. It is remarkable that it was headed by Adoni-Zedech, King of Jerusalem, by name, pretension, and office, the actual type of Antichrist. By NAME, the *Lord of Righteousness*—Antichrist will assume the name, as the anti-Messiah, of the Righteous Adoni. By PRETENSION, exhibit himself as the true object of worship, (2 Thess. ii. 4,) and deny the Father and the Son, (Dan. xi. 36, 37; 1 John ii. 22.) By OFFICE, be king of Jerusalem, (Dan. xi. 41—45. As Adoni-Zedech and his confederate kings were subjugated and destroyed, the feet of Joshua's captains being placed upon their necks, so shall Antichrist and his confederate kings. Thus does Messiah address the giver of victory, whose *right*

hand hath holden him up in the conflict with his foes.—“I have pursued mine enemies and overtaken them: neither did I turn again till they were consumed. I have stamped them to the ground that they were not able to rise. They are fallen *under my feet*. For thou has girded me with strength to the battle; thou hast subdued under me those that rose up against me. Thou hast also given me the *necks* of mine enemies, that I might destroy them.” (Psalm xviii. 35—40; comp. Isa. xxx. 28.) Again the Prophet, foreseeing the judgment of the Ammonites, says, “Whiles they see vanity unto thee, whiles they divine a lie unto thee, to bring thee *upon the necks of the slain*, upon the necks of the wicked, *whose day is come*, when their iniquity shall have an end,” (Ezekiel xxi. 29.) And as the captains of Joshua trod on kings in the day of Joshua’s conquest, so shall the righteous in the day of Jesus’ victory. They who fear his name, “shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be as ashes *under the soles of their feet*, in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of Hosts.” (Mal. iv. 3.) But there is also another idea attached to the expression, which implies simply the subjection and not the extinction of those, who are made the footstool of conquerors. Thus spake the prophet to the Jews, through Zedekiah, their king, “Bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people, and live,” (Jer. xxvii. 12.) Zion’s most piteous complaint at present is, “our necks are under persecution; we labour and have no rest,” (Lam. v. 5.) Thus the Assyrian, overflowing Immanuel’s land, is to “reach even to the neck,” (Isa. viii. 8.) But the burden, which the mystic Assyrian imposeth, it is predicted shall be removed from off their shoulder, (Isa. x. 27.) In the day of Judah’s triumph, however, it is written, on the other hand, “He bringeth down them that dwell on high; the lofty city he layeth it low, even to the ground; he bringeth it even to the dust; The *foot* shall tread it down, even the feet of the poor and the steps of the needy,” (Isa. xxvi. 5, 6.) Addressing the covetous, who take possession of lands by violence; and the oppressors, who defraud innocent families and eject them from their homes, the Lord saith, “Behold, against this family do I devise an evil, from which ye shall not remove your *necks*, neither shall ye go haughtily,” (Mic. ii. 3.) The whole matter is summed up in Psalm xlvii. which may be regarded not only as parallel to, but also as an enlarged exposition of the thought, *rule thou* in the midst of thine enemies.

1. O *softly apply** your hand, all ye peoples,
Shout unto God with the voice of triumph,
2. For Jehovah the High, the Terrible,
Is the great king over all the earth:
3. He subdueth the peoples under us,
And the nations UNDER OUR FEET.
4. He chooseth for us our inheritance,
The elation of Jacob whom he loveth. SELAH.
5. God is gone up with loud shouting,
Jehovah with the sound of a trumpet.
6. Sing ye, God, sing ye,
Sing ye to Jehovah, sing ye.
7. He is established King of all the earth—
Sing ye God with understanding.
8. God reigneth over the Gentiles,
God sitteth on the throne of his holiness.
9. The willing of the peoples are gathered together,
A people of the God of Abraham.
Because the protectors of the earth are for God,
He is greatly exalted.

In this Psalm, which Horseley properly names “A Song of Triumph, in prospect of the establishment of God’s universal kingdom,” Messiah having become the Great King over all the earth is described (ver. 3,) not as extinguishing, but subduing the nations, when he placeth them under the feet of Israel. —Having achieved this conquest, he goeth “up the hill of Sion. God is described as returning to his ancient seat among the chosen people;”† and reigning over the Gentiles, the *willing* amongst them or “the voluntary ones,” as Horseley has it, gather themselves unto him in contradistinction to the residue, and are formed into a people of the God of Abraham. While the Protectors or Princes of the people being on his side, his exaltation is complete, and very greatly is he to be feared. So that we are here presented with a full explanation of the dominion, which Messiah exercises in the midst of his enemies. Thus accurately, therefore, does the act of the Father, in sending forth Messiah’s sceptre from Zion, and causing him to rule amidst his foes, correspond with the engagement that he would cause him to make them his footstool. Returning then to Ps. cx. I find, in addition, that he is to receive the offerings of free will in this day of his power, when surrounded with the splendours of his Saints, just as the willing of the people are said to gather around him, (Ps. xlvii. 9;) and when the dew of his progeny shall become more numerous than those, which spring from the morning’s womb. Furthermore, I find it is predicted of him, at this juncture, that he will strike through kings, strive with the Heathen, filling all with slaughter, and wound

* To the mouth, in allusion to the practice still observed among the Syrian women, who in joy keep patting the mouth as they chaunt, “Lillè li li li,” which they call the Zeraleet.

† Horseley.

the head of the mighty ones upon the earth. Can it be shewn, that such a day of wrath thus dawned upon earth when he ascended on high, and took his seat at the right hand? Still two difficulties may be urged—one, from the oath, which is recorded (ver. 4,) “thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech.” Paul teaches us that he is already made so, (Heb. vi. 20,) and argues the change of the Law from the change of the Priesthood, (Heb. vii. 11, 12.) But the same Paul tells us he had many things to say of him, as such, which were hard to be uttered, by reason of our dulness in hearing, (Heb. v. 11;) so hard to be uttered that in the exposition of his priesthood he confines himself to the analogy, which existed between it and that of Aaron; carefully notices his kingship of Salem, (Heb. vii. 1;) the new covenant, which, in the exercise of his office, he is hereafter to make with Israel (viii. 8;) and his future return at the judgment, from the holiest of all, (into which he hath entered for us,) without sin, unto the salvation of those that look for him, (Heb. ix. 28.) He is now behind the vail. Hereafter he shall come forth; his Epiphany as High Priest, in all the gorgeous robes of office shall take place, and he shall assume his seat upon his throne as king of Jerusalem, (see Zechar. vi. 12—15, comp. with Zech. ix. 9—17, and xiv. 16.) That this reference to the Melchisedech priesthood does not connect itself with his entrance upon the priestly office at the ascension, or with his present mediation, as such in the Holiest of all, but with his future exercise of power, as the royal Priest, I argue from the fact that this oath, which was sworn to him, and registered above, from the foundation of the world, is introduced manifestly in corroboration of the subject matter of the Psalm—that the peoples shall be subdued by him, and under him in the day of his might, when as **KING OF RIGHTEOUSNESS**, he shall come in the splendour of his saints; that the Lord at his right hand, shall smite through kings in the day of his wrath; and that the sceptre, which belongeth to him as the Melchisedech or *King of Righteousness*, shall be no less an instrument of power than a symbol of imperial supremacy. The other objection may be drawn from the statement, in the last verse, “he shall drink of the brook by the way,” which has been variously interpreted of the Messiah in his day of sorrow—of the cup of anguish which he drank—of the brook Kidron, by which he trod his weary way, and on whose banks he tasted of his last dread agony—of the aid, which he sought, in his toilsome travels from the water, which the streams of Judea afforded, &c. But, independently of the fact, that such a notice of his woe very ill accords with the general subject of the Psalm; and would form an inapt conclu-

sion to the history of his exaltation: I must request of you to notice that it constitutes a part of the *third portion* of the Psalm, in which there is a remarkable change of person from the second to the third.—This change of person fully warrants Horsey's idea of its being an *oracular response* corroborative of the Psalmist's previous address to Messiah, his Adoni, on his exaltation to the right hand of the Majesty on High—Verse 7, establishes the fact, by a direct voice from the sanctuary, that he shall be himself active in destroying his enemies, but more especially the head of the mighty ones on the earth. That head over many countries is unquestionably the Man of Sin, the Antichrist. The correct version is given, I believe, by Fry,

7. He drinketh of the Nile on the way,
Therefore he lifteth high his head.

His note is excellent. "I consider נח here as a proper name; Parkhurst observes—'from the Hebrew נח is plainly derived the Greek Νεῖλος, Latin *Nilus*, and English *Nile*.' The express meaning of the Hebrew term is a low, hollow valley, with a stream running through the midst, by which it is occasionally overflowed. The channels of most streams that issue from the mountains, answer to this description; and the whole land of Egypt may be considered as a channel of a mountain torrent, on a larger scale, whose stream usually flows quietly in the midst of it, but is subject to its periodical overflows." To which he adds, in his exposition, "Daniel, or rather the Angel interpreter that addresses himself to the Prophet in chapter xii. has clearly foreshewn, that one circumstance in the last conflict, on the eve of the second Advent, will be the seizing of Egypt by the bestial power; by which circumstance his heart is elated, and he becomes infuriated to his destruction." Thus viewed the discomfited head of many countries, being inflated with judicial haughtiness of head, is represented as bringing down on himself the predicted calamity. But rapid as are the changes in prophecy from person to person, I am still unwilling to decide at once, with Mr. Fry, that it is Antichrist, who drinketh by the way. I am rather constrained to regard the prediction as referring to the conquering Messiah victorious over the mystic Egyptian, who while he obtains refreshment from the living fountain, in communion with the Father, just as a wearied warrior in his march satisfies his thirst from the rivulet that flows along his sultry route, shall also drink of the blood of the slain, as is predicted of Israel, who "shall not lie down, until he eat of the prey and drink of the blood of the slain," (Num. xxiii. 24, comp. Isa. lxiii. 1-6;) in which last place, moreover, Messiah is like-

wise described as TREADING DOWN the peoples, with whose blood his raiment is sprinkled.

Further, it may be proper to observe, concerning the expression, with which the psalm opens, "sit thou at my right hand," that it is far from being expressive of the idea of independent sovereignty. The right hand is a place of dignity and authority, but it is a place of reflected dignity and of derivative authority. Thus at the right hand of Jesus stands the Queen, in gold of Ophir, Psalm xlv. 9. Thus of old, on his right hand, was Queen Bathsheba seated, when she made her suit for Adonijah to King Solomon. The power and the honour implied in the session at the right hand, therefore, is not expressive of power as *of self* directed, nor of honour as *of self* proceeding. That seat simply denoteth the station of dignity and influence which belongeth to him, whom the king delighteth to honour. But this position, when taken by a superior, while it may only denote condescension, is in Scripture employed to express the relief, which he brings to the weak, the afflicted, or the oppressed. We meet with both uses of the word in Messiah's song of confidence, in the prospect of his resurrection, and in the anticipation of the soul-satisfying results of the travail of his soul, (Ps. xvi. 8-11.) First he sees Jehovah at his right hand in the day of trial;—I SHALL NOT BE MOVED, is the conclusion which he draws. Again, the impossibility of his seeing corruption leads to the confident assurance, "thou wilt shew me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy; *at thy right hand* are pleasures for evermore." From hence I argue, that when the Supreme Power the Fountain of honour, saith, "sit thou at my right hand," he confers a grant of honour, authority, and consequent enjoyment, subsidiary to his own. Hence the present position of Messiah, as intimated in these words, implies not the direct active exercise of an independent sovereignty, such as is imported in the words, "rule thou in the midst of thine enemies," but simply a quiescent concurrence.

We have hitherto been arguing on the idea, that 1 Cor. xv. 25, is a direct quotation from Ps. cx. 1, but it is much more; the introduction of the word ALL considerably amplifies the idea, which is there met with. When seated at his right hand, Jehovah simply promises Messiah to make his enemies his footstool. Here it is said of Christ, "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." Now the reason for this universal proposition we find from ver. 27, to be derived from Psalm viii. 6, "FOR, he hath put all things under his feet," the very words of David, in the prophecy where he views Jesus as stilling the enemy and the avenger, and as

invested with entire jurisdiction, and with the active, uncontrolled dominion of the material creation. Whence Paul views the whole as prospective, also adding, ver. 28, "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

Having removed these difficulties, I now proceed to the examination of the context. It occurs in a lengthened discussion of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, which some choose to limit to the question of the resurrection of believers of this dispensation, but on what principle I know not. The statement is as general as possible, in the words immediately preceding this important passage. "Since by man came death, by man came also a resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam ALL die, even so in Christ, shall ALL be made alive. BUT EVERY MAN IN HIS OWN ORDER." It has been remarked, that the word, *ταγμα*, signifies *band*. It is indifferent as to our present argument.—There is a subsequent distinction made, not only between the bands themselves, but also, between the periods of their resurrection. The worth of that band, which obtains precedence, is infinitely great, but numerically, it only comprehends a UNIT. CHRIST, THE FIRST FRUITS, great anti-type of the Paschal Wave-sheaf (Lev. xxiii. 10—14,) by which the barley harvest was sanctified. AFTERWARDS, (*επειτα*), long posterior to the resurrection of the first band "they that are Christ's at his coming, or at his own presenee," (*παρουσια αυτου*.) Most carefully, in the very terms by which this band is distinguished, are the ungodly excluded from all participation with them in the act of rising from the grave.—This is acceded—The saints are allowed to have the precedence, by a very brief interval, which, if I understand the reasoning correctly, cannot extend beyond a few *seconds*, or it may be a few *hours*. That it must be a very short period, within the compass of a natural day, that intervenes between their resurrection, and that of the rest of the dead, is argued from the adverb of time, with which the next clause opens. THEN, (*υτα*), THE END. The preeeding adverb of time, (*επειτα*), *afterwards* is said to be "suited to denote a long interval;" the adverb *υτα*, on the contrary, it is said, is only "suited to denote a short interval," because the places in which Mr. Gipps discovers its employment, have reference only to a brief period. We are not interested, as we shall soon see, in adjusting the relative claims of these two adverbs, or to arbitrate between them as to their capacity of expressing a long interval of time; but we may remark as somewhat singular, that the Lexicographical skill of Scapula, was insufficient to discover this inequality of power

between them. He renders them both by the same words, *postea deinde, tum*. But let the criticism stand, and what then? If, *εἴτα*, even be admitted to import an immediate succession of the event, to the notice of which it is prefixed, it will equally serve our purpose; for that event shall indeed immediately succeed, not the resurrection of the saints, but the (*παρουσία*, or) presence of Jesus. You will perceive at once, that this term is not restricted, like our English word *coming*, to the very moment of his appearing, or arrival; but to the entire period of his presence as king. "Afterwards, they that are Christ's, during his presence"—*then*, when the period thus characterized cometh to its close—the *end*. But the period of his *presence* is necessarily a very long interval, for it is during this period he reigns in the midst of his enemies as the David, and finally deprives them of all evil energy, as the Solomon. I have further to observe, that the resurrection of the saints is, in my judgment, symbolized by another typical action, analogous to that of the wave-sheaf, whereby the resurrection of Jesus was adumbrated. Fifty days after the sheaf of barley was waved, two leavened wheaten loaves, the produce of the ensuing wheat harvest, were commanded to be waved in like manner; and of these, it was also said, "they are the first fruits unto the Lord," (Lev. xxiii. 17.) In reading this, I am at once reminded of the words, "we being many, are one loaf," (1 Cor. x. 17,) and I discover in the double offering, an indication of the two-fold church, Israelitish and Gentile; Jacob and Jeshurun, or the righteous ones; the two witnesses, both of Isaiah and St. John (comp. Isa. xliii. 10, and xliv. 2—8, with Rev. xi. 3, 4, and i. 20.) Thus Zechariah's two branched candlestick, with its two connected olive trees, which are interpreted to denote the "two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth," having the true anointing that teacheth all things; and the two women who obtain the empire, on the destruction of the apostacy, which is named WICKEDNESS, (Zech. iv. 11—14, and v. 5—11,) doth also portray the same mystic body, separate, yet united.—Viewing then the resurrection of the saints, as the first fruits of another harvest, it necessarily follows, that *the end* must be postponed till that harvest can be gathered. This is the design of that approaching dispensation, wherein the Queen-consort of the Lamb, shall be a fruitful mother indeed, and the dew of her progeny shall be more numerous than the dew-drops from the morning's womb.

Concerning *the end* itself, I fully accord with Mr. Gipps, that it does denote a crisis which was right well understood by the Corinthian church; and which, I believe, to be the

actual *re-establishment of all things* spoken of by all the holy prophets, to which those *times* are introductory, at the commencement of which, Christ shall come back from the heavens, that must retain him till then, (Acts iii. 21.) I further agree with Mr. Gipps, that *the end* here spoken of, is not the termination of the thousand years, but of that much longer period, which shall elapse before all enemies are fully deprived of their evil energy. It is needless to enter further on the subject in this place, as any additional observations I might make, would have no direct bearing on the subject, and would lead to a discussion, far more copious than what I now propose to myself.

I have postponed till now one other passage, on which Mr. Gipps relies, as indicative of the simultaneous judgment of all the living, and all the dead, and therefore the simultaneous resurrection of the just and of the unjust.—“I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing, and his kingdom,” 2 Tim. iv. 1. I reserved this place for the last, that we might arrive first at a correct idea, both of the judgment which Christ is to exercise, and of the kingdom which he is to possess.—The words literally run, “I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, the future one (or who is hereafter) to judge living ones, and dead ones, at his own epiphany, and his own kingdom.” Were all the living, and all the dead to be judged at the very hour of the Epiphany, and every thing concerning them to be finally determined, at one and the same moment, then would it never have been added as making the juncture, that the future Lord will also judge them *at his own kingdom*.—The difficulty, which this expression threw in his way, was so fully felt by Mr. Gipps, that he was obliged to add a note apologetic for departing from his own exposition of the kingdom, which is to be delivered up, as over enemies; for he saw at once, that if this kingdom, according to his idea, was to be given up at the resurrection of the saints, it could never be here spoken of, an event equally future with the Epiphany itself.—He therefore sends us for light to all the passages, which we have examined in the beginning of this letter; and further, attempts to make a distinction between *THE kingdom* of 1 Cor. xv. 24, which Christ delivers up, and which must therefore have previously been *his own*; and *HIS kingdom* in the verse before us,—the sole ground of the criticism being, that the word *kingdom*, has an article prefixed to it in one place, and a personal pronoun in the other!—With equal force might it be argued, that because the words *his own body, the church*, have each the personal pronoun annexed, Eph. i. 22, and Col.

i. 24, they must refer to quite a different matter from *the body, the church* of which he is described to be the head, Col. i. 18. His exposition of the meaning of the expression, *his kingdom*, however, renders it rather an *indefinite* kind of mark for determining the precise juncture for the occurrence of that *natural day*, in which he maintains, that all the living, and all the dead, are at one, and the same moment, to be judged.—“Here, says he, “the expression is *his kingdom*, which appears to me, to signify his kingdom of the Gospel in this life, and of eternal glory in the life to come.” Supposing this notion to be correct, we may substitute the definition for the words defined.—See how the passage will then read, “who shall judge the quick and the dead at his epiphany, and his kingdom of the gospel in this life, and of eternal glory in the life to come.”—If this be the sense of the passage, the notion of the judgment being confined to a day of four and twenty hours, is necessarily overturned, and the period of judgment is made to embrace, not a thousand years only, but the whole period, from the first advent onward, at least, to the judgment before the white throne, which must include very nearly three Millennaries, and more, for ought that we are informed.—This, however, is a greater concession than I demand. I am willing to strike out of the account, the whole of the present dispensation, considering the period of judgment, for the purpose of exercising which, Jesus Christ, as the future Lord, shall appear, is to be measured solely by the interval, which shall elapse between his approaching Epiphany, and the delivering up of his kingdom.—During all that period, concerning the duration of which, with the exception of the intimation of the fact, that it is to be for the ages of the ages, no light is afforded us in Scripture; he will continue to exercise the office of Judge, and sit on David’s throne, as king, that he may effectually paralyse every enemy.—At his Epiphany, and at his Kingdom, which is successive to his Epiphany, the process of judging will go forward—dead ones, as well as living ones, shall submit to the sceptre, which he wields. I know not that I have omitted to notice any argument that has been urged, though I have not attempted to pursue, with the arguments of a logician, the syllogisms, which have been so unsparingly accumulated on this branch of the enquiry.—Mr. Gipps’ third chapter we must reserve for another occasion.

Yours affectionately, &c. &c.

LETTER V.

Literal and Figurative interpretation discussed—Symbols—Psa. xi. 6—8. The Branch and Root of Jesse—Isa. lv. 12, 13. Resurrection of Souls—Mr. Gipps' Rules of Literal and Figurative Interpretation examined—First Resurrection as connected with the Statements in Zech. xiv. 1—11. Luke xx. 34—36. Acts iv. 1, 2. 1 Cor. xv. Phil. iii. 11.

Mr. Gipps' third chapter, which professedly treats of the arguments in favour of the Millenarian interpretation, opens with some general remarks on the nature of *literal* and *figurative* interpretation as applied to Rev. xx. 4. In discussing this subject he has fallen into the very common error of confounding *symbols* with *figures*. We can scarcely take up any ordinary composition without meeting with occasional instances of *figurative* writing. If it be the production of a poetic mind, we are examining, the indications of a lively imagination will exhibit themselves in every page;—illustrations, similes, original conceptions, allusions to remote analogies, with various proofs of the writer's possession of the ideal faculty, will present themselves in every direction. I cannot open a letter of Cowper's, written in all the confidence of friendship to his ordinary correspondents, without finding images, continually recurring, which prove the writer to have been a man of poetic genius. I have this moment opened the first Vol. of Hayley's collection of his correspondence at random, and I find him in speaking of our recognition of friends in a future life, writing;—"For my own part, this life is such a momentary thing, and all its interests have so shrunk in my estimation, since by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, I became attentive to the things of another; that like a *worm in the bud* of all my friendships and affections, this very thought would *eat the heart out of them all*, had I a thousand; and were their date to terminate with this life, I think I should have no inclination to *cultivate* and improve such a fugitive business."* Again, describing the morning meals of his pigeons, in a few letters onward to Mr. Unwin, he adds, "if your wish should be accomplished, and you should find yourself furnished with the wings of a dove, I shall undoubtedly find you amongst them. Only be so good, if that should be the case, to announce yourself by some means or other. For I imagine your crop will require something better than tares to fill it."† Here are *figures* in abundance,

* Letter xx.

† Letter xxxvii.

but any man of common understanding will at once perceive they are figures. He will be in no danger of misconceiving their import. He will not be deceived for a moment into the idea of it being possible for Mr. Unwin to be metamorphosed into a pigeon; for a real worm to eat away friendship—for friendship itself to be possessed of a *bud* or a *heart*, or for an agriculturist to cultivate the *field* of affection. I now turn to Burke on the French Revolution. I open him, in like manner, and I read the following passage in the first page I meet with, where he endeavours to rebut the idea, that the radical spouters of the Old Jewry and the London Tavern are the fair representatives of English feeling. “Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, whilst thousands of great cattle, reposed beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the inhabitants of the field; that of course, they are many in number; or that, after all, they are more than the little shrivelled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hour.”* Now here we have nothing but figure, and yet the figure is so plain throughout, we at once perceive the similitude, which is drawn between the grasshoppers and the noisy revolutionary debaters of the Tavern, on the one hand; and between the nobler animals of the pasture, whose tranquillity they disturb not, and the rational population of Great Britain on the other. Yet does this passage of our great orator, more nearly approximate to the style of parable, than what we usually meet with in compositions that delight in imagery. A parable however, is but an expanded figure, applied to the illustration of a fact, or series of facts, in which the actors are shadowed out by metaphors, that are allusive to their respective characters and conduct. The books of Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, almost entirely consist of figures of the common kind, as applied to moral truths.—As for instance, “the name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and is safe. The rich man’s wealth is his strong city, and as an high wall in his own conceit,” Prov. xviii. 10—11. No man can be at a loss to understand the thoughts intended to be conveyed by this highly figurative language. Nay, they are far more vividly presented to the mind than they could possibly be, without the use of figure. Every epithet which denotes security, would be accumulated in vain, to express the righteous man’s safety, with half the force which those few words convey. To say he is secure is nothing; but to describe him as possessed of an impregnable fortress, in *the name of the Lord*—the Word Je-

* Burke’s Works.—*Lond. Rivington*, 1815, vol. v. p. 165.

hovah, whither he betakes himself for shelter, when danger is at hand, with all the speed of a running man, is to set before us at once, in the strongest possible light, the unassailable object of his trust; and at the same time, the life of watchfulness it is his to lead, and that active habitude of mind, which causes an immediate unloitering recurrence to his strong hold, when a lion is in his path. While the notion is vastly increased by the contrast of the avaricious man, with vain confidence, indolently reposing in the midst of his wealth, and regarding it not merely as a confined tower, but as a well fortified city, through whose ample dimensions he may seek his pastime, when his lethargy will allow him, without apprehension or alarm. The constant use of figure in the writings of the wise man, has never been urged as an argument in proof of the obscurity of this portion of scripture, or as any reason why a mystic sense should be resorted to in the interpretation, in preference to the literal import. In the narrative of the creation I find it said, that *the Spirit of God moved*, fluttered or brooded, an expression taken from the action of a mother bird, tremulously engaged in the work of incubation, *upon the faces of the waters*,—the *faces* of the waters! In this one sentence I have two figures employed, would I therefore, be justified in saying, that the narrative of the creation ought to be taken figuratively; or that in the sense ordinarily attached to the words, “God said, let there be light, and there was light,” we have been giving credit to a fable; that light also is a figure, and may denote the diffusion of knowledge, at a time anterior to Adam; that the earth being *unformed, and hollow*, *הוה* may signify the uncivilized, and insincere state of society, before the era of authentic history; and that the darkness, which covered the faces of the waters, or riotous multitude, a sense in which the word is elsewhere used, implies no more than Isaiah meant, when he said, “darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people,” Isa. lx. 2? I believe there is scarcely a narrative in existence, sacred, or profane, in which figure is not employed, are we therefore at liberty to torture all history, and mould into such mystic shape as may please us best, and twist it into such reticulated network, as will most harmonize with our notions of the concatenations of events? But hold,—what words are these, which I have caught myself in using?—torture—mould—twist—net-work. I pray you to observe that they are mental, not manual operations, to which I refer; and, with this caution, I beg you to understand me literally. What I demand for myself, I now proceed to claim for the sacred writers. When we speak of persons, who are under moral or physical restraint, there can be no more com-

mon figure of speech than that, which describes the restrained parties as being enchained, or in bonds. Thus, when we speak of the Roman Catholic peasantry, as being in bondage to their priests, we are at once understood to mean, that a fearful tyranny, of a moral nature, is exercised over their minds to a degree, which forbids the due exercise of their mental faculties; and though we neither meant, nor were understood to affirm, that the bodies of these wretched dupes were manacled with material fetters, yet no suspicion lurks in the minds of those, to whom we address ourselves, that our general statement is to be taken figuratively, because we happened to employ this figure in speaking. In like manner, when Paul speaks of "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into *bondage*," Gal. ii. 4; no one ever supposed him to attribute to these false brethren, the design of casting him into bonds; and yet have they never argued from hence, or from the other figures, with which even this chapter abounds, that the epistle to the Galatians is a figurative book, which we are not at liberty to understand literally. I meet with this same figure in Prov. i. 8, 9, "My son, hear the instruction of thy Father, and forsake not the law of thy mother; for they shall be an ornament of grace," or a graceful wreath, "unto thy head, and chains about thy neck;" a statement which was never understood of actual captivity, but of that moral restraint, which wise instruction imposeth on the corruption of the flesh, placing, as it were, the willing neck of the obedient pupil, under the ornamental yoke of sound discipline, rendering his character attractive, and crowning him with an unfading wreath of moral beauty. Asaph, on the other hand, says of the wicked, "pride compasseth them about, as a chain, violence covereth them as a garment," Psalms lxxiii. 6. Nothing of moral loveliness is here, but the wretched victims of infidelity clothed with the garment of violence, are represented as the miserable captives of the pride that ruins them. Now the occurrence of this figure, in a Psalm, or in Proverbs, or in Galatians, or in ordinary conversation or writing, presents no difficulty; and we are at once able to understand the meaning attached to it, without calling in the aid of a Beyman, or a Scott. I know no reason, therefore, why we should find it necessary to invite their guidance, when we come to Rev. xx. 2. I can understand the apostle there, as describing the effectual restraint imposed on Satan in the abyss, during the period of the thousand years, without considering myself any more bound to depart from the literal sense, in my interpretation of this prediction, than I am bound to do so in my interpretation of

Psalms, Proverbs, and Galatians. But Revelations is entirely a figurative book! This I distinctly deny. It is not one twentieth part as figurative as the book of Proverbs. But though it is not *figurative*, it is *symbolical*.

A SYMBOL I would define to be, some sensible object, capable of being presented to the eye, with some definite, well understood meaning, attached to it, by which it may be fitted to speak to us with a degree of precision, with which no words in any spoken language since the confusion of tongues can do. Symbolic language so copiously employed in prophecy, is a universal language, intelligible to every kindred, and tongue, and tribe, and people. It is a pictorial language, painting as it were on canvass, with inimitable precision, every object that is to be presented to the mind. It is the unspoken pantomime, wherein the great drama of all prophecy is exhibited by mute action, with an accuracy that defies mistake, when vision is perfect. It is in just such language the principal portion of the book of Revelations is penned, interrupted occasionally with oracular utterances from the mercy seat, or the interlocution of the Apostle with the interpreting Angel. But the language of symbol is occasionally departed from, and the plainest language that can be used, is employed, to discourse to us of things to come. If such be the structure of this mysterious book, it may be asked, whence the numerous mistakes, into which men have fallen, in their attempts to expound it? Some regarding no portion of it fulfilled yet, and others interpreting it as if it were all accomplished. I answer at once by attributing all the error to their ignorance of or inattention to symbols, or to their defect of vision. If we are acquainted with symbolic language, we shall be at once able to translate it into our ordinary dialect, and if the scenic representation passes before our eyes in the same order, wherein it did before the eyes of John, there can be no room for misconception. If men will attach meanings to symbols they were never designed to have; if they deny the existence of symbol, where symbol is obvious; or if they misplace the symbolic scenes, we shall have great abundance of error. But where can we obtain a symbolic dictionary? In the Bible itself. Thus after the first vision in the Apocalypse we are given the exposition of the leading symbols—"The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches," (Rev. i. 20;) while he who walked among the churches, and who held their angels in his right hand, describes himself in plain and unequivocal language, thus—"I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore,"

which character of himself, together with the Apostle's note in the commencement, that he was *one like unto the Son of Man*, can leave no doubt on the mind, that it was Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, with the vision of whom, in his glory, he was thus favoured. All that remains of this vision now is the description of his person, in which indeed we meet with abundant use of figure in the way of illustration—wool, snow, a flame of fire, heated brass, the sound of many waters, the sun shining in its strength, are all expressly used as *similes*, by John, to give some faint ideas of the glorious person of Messiah. But are we to conclude, because these figures are employed by him to describe what he actually saw, although we meet with them also in other parts of Scripture, as characteristic of his person, that his appearance does not literally correspond with what St. John here describes it? Now, from this example you will perceive that while both symbol and figure are employed to furnish out this vision, the whole description is neither symbolical nor figurative, but plain matter of fact, as Messiah's description of himself, and his command to John, "write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter." What is symbolical is translated for us into plain language; and what is figurative is obvious to the meanest capacity. For the exposition of every vision, however, that is contained in this book, we have not always the same helps at hand; and yet I venture to say they are within the reach of the patient investigator, and will reward his diligent search if he be found relying, not on his own expository skill, but on the teaching of the Holy Spirit. The above vision, thus graciously expounded for us, appears very mercifully to have been prefixed to the whole book, as a kind of easy lesson, by which we may learn the nature of symbolic writing, and acquire a facility in reading and comprehending it, before we advance in our enquiries, through the whole range of symbols. All is literally true of the churches, of the angels who superintend them, and of the Chief Shepherd himself, which is here predicated of their respective symbols. It is not allowable to mysticise the whole description—Jesus does *walk* among the churches, he does hold their angels in his *hand*. Walk! Hand! Here is figure or symbol, it matters not which. Is the one expression more obscure or unintelligible than what is written, Ps. cxvii. 16, "the right hand of the Lord is exalted, the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly," or Ps. xviii. 35, "thy right hand hath holden me up?" And is the other expression more difficult of solution than the statement, which we meet with amongst a mass of Levitical precepts, Deut. xxiii. 14,

“For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp,” or the words of Ps. civ. 3, “Who walketh upon the wings of the wind?” From all this you will perceive, that my canon of interpretation, as it regards any symbolical writing, is,—“translate the symbols *first* into ordinary language, and then expound it as you would any other composition.” Should I be found guilty of a departure from this rule myself, by omitting to translate symbols where they exist, or by attempting to translate as a symbol, that which is not a symbol, my inconsistency will not vitiate the correctness of the rule. I beg this remark to be taken into consideration, as I might otherwise have my errors charged upon all millenarian expositors; as Mr. Gipps inconsiderately has charged the inconsistencies of *two* anonymously quoted writers of *canons* on all, who happen to support their general views. I beg that my dear brethren, who are looking with me for the personal advent of our beloved Redeemer, to reign on his father David’s throne, may be exempted from censure on account of any errors of exposition, or inconsistencies in the views, which, through the ignorance that is in me, I may rashly express. One rule of interpretation reasoned on by Mr. Gipps, is, as quoted by him, from whom I know not, that “we are bound to give a literal interpretation, where it is possible, according to the nature of things.” If this be applied to symbolical writing, and be designed to guide us in the discovery of symbols; and if by literal interpretation be meant the obvious import, which any figures that meet us in the course of exposition, as in the passages already quoted from Burke and Cowper, I know not but that this canon may be very rational and just. But Mr. Gipps has applied it to predictions, which are not symbolical, and perhaps there is also some difference of opinion as to what a *literal interpretation* signifies. I would call him a literal interpreter of Burke’s work on the French Revolution, who with cold philosophic glance, viewing the flowers of speech that exhale their sweets on every hand, and rise indigenously, throughout that rich meadow of rhetoric, in which it was his delight to luxuriate, would content himself with expounding the plain unadorned thoughts of that great writer.

Now I proceed to apply the rule I have laid down above, to the cases produced by Mr. Gipps. The first is, the prediction of Isaiah, that animals of opposite tendencies, shall herd and feed together, and beasts of prey become graminivorous, (Isa. xi. 6—8.) This he triumphantly argues, would not be according to “*the nature of things*,” which the author before cited, requires to be the case, where the interpretation is literal, but

that it would be “an entirely *new nature of things*.” Though it would, however, be quite a change of nature to the lower animals, were they to acquire these properties, yet is there something of a quibble on the word *nature*, for it may be according to *the nature of things*, though not according to *the nature of beasts*, that this change in their habits should take place. And I maintain this to be the fact. It is in the nature of things that the Creator should produce whatever change he pleases in their habits, and having assured us it is his pleasure that this change shall take place, we reckon assuredly that it must needs literally come to pass. This view of the matter brings abundant satisfaction to my mind, but let us refer to the prophecy itself, concerning these beasts. Neither figure nor symbol can I find throughout it.—Not a note of similitude do we meet with.—If I look to the context indeed, I find two symbols, and but *two*, which are employed, by universal consent, to shadow out the Redeemer.—This contrivance seems to be resorted to, to avoid naming him, and yet to mark him out, with a precision inimitable, as identical at once, with the Man of Sorrows, and with the future King of Zion.—The opening of the chapter, presents him before us as a rod, or *humble twig*, shooting out of the decayed stump of Jesse, a Branch or Nazarene, γ , becoming fruitful, as it ariseth out of that ancient root.—Though scripture elsewhere afforded me no other information, than what the prophecy itself affords, I should at once perceive from the actions and character ascribed to this twig, that it must symbolize some mighty personage, eminent for moral purity, and the righteous exercise of regal power over the earth, hereafter to arise from the reduced family of David’s sire. The Spirit of Jehovah, of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord, could not, in the nature of things, abide on a mere vegetable cutting. No offset from any tree of the forest, however vigorous, could be endowed, unless it were first metamorphosed into a rational being, of which no hint is given us, with the intelligent properties, and judicial prerogatives, and regal power, and animal organs of sight, and hearing, and speech, and pulmonary action, here ascribed to the Branch.—The natural actions of a just Prince, enforcing the rights of the poor, and vindicating the meek of the earth; nay more, the supernatural acts of divine power, smiting the earth with the rod, or rather, blast of his mouth, and slaying the wicked one with the breath of his lips, are all attributed to this lordly sucker from Jesse’s stump.—A symbol therefore, that sucker must manifestly be, and yet all that is affirmed concerning it, is literally true of him, whom that symbol represents.—Yet,

in the description which is given of it, not a figure is employed, till in the fifth verse we meet with these words, *righteousness shall be the GIRDLE OF HIS LOINS*; and *faithfulness THE GIRDLE OF HIS REINS*. Can the occurrence of such a figure by which the moral properties of his reign are illustrated by the cincture, which, binding up the flowing vesture of the Prince, prevents him from being impeded in discharging the active duties of office, offer any impediment to the literal exposition of this plain and blessed prophecy? Now it is in direct connection with these words, yea, and immediately consecutive to them, that the prophecy concerning the lower animals, as dwelling anew together, in all the peace and harmony of Eden, occurs, without the indication of any figure or symbol, that I can discern. It is introduced simply as another feature of that glorious era, in which Jesse's Branch shall reign, in righteousness.—Just as it is said that righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins so is it said that the wolf and the lamb, the leopard and the kid, the calf and the young lion and the fatling shall dwell and repose together, and be led by a little child; that the cow and the she bear shall amicably brouse upon the same pasture, while their young ones slumber together on the same bank; and that the lion, carnivorous as he is now, shall then be satisfied with straw, like the ox. Besides we know that the digestive organs will, without any miracle, adapt themselves to the food that is habitually provided for them. Such a state of things, we verily believe existed once,—*namely*, before the fall of man and the curse—and it may, therefore, exist again. “Every kind of beasts and of birds, and of serpents and of sea monsters is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind,” (James iii. 7.) If it be in the nature of things, that man can counteract the predial propensities, which his own original offence introduced amongst the beasts of the field and the birds of the air; it must surely be within the nature of things, not to speak of the assurances of prophecy on the subject, that he who originally framed them the loving and peaceable dependants of his vice-gerent, in this lower world, should again render them submissive to him

Whom once, as delegate of God on earth,
They feared, and as his perfect image, loved.

Not so marvellous would be the exercise of that taming power, which should restore them to their original inoffensive character, as is the daily miracle, which is wrought, when the evil tongue of the regenerated sinner, which *no man can tame*, by grace is tamed; and the poison of asps, which was as constantly generated as its saliva, ceases to be secreted within the glands that supplied it.

But we have hitherto reasoned upon this subject, as if Scripture afforded us no further information, yet are we expressly taught by St. Paul, not indeed without figure, but still with no more of figure than on other subjects he employs, that "the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, (for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same,) in hope that the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, and not only they but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." (Rom. viii. 19-23.) I will satisfy myself with the mere quotation of this most important passage; but, as ingenious attempts have been made to extract from it any other meaning than that, which is its obvious and natural import, I send you a copy of a letter which may, in some measure, serve for its rescue from perversion.*

I have already observed, that a second symbol occurs in the context of this prediction, concerning the future condition of the lower animals, and that by universal consent, it shadows out the Redeemer. The first represented him as an humble twig, out-sprouting from Jesse's root, to whom all those features are attributed as universal King, which we have just noticed. The second describes him as the root from which Jesse sprang. The one exhibits him as the Word made flesh, the natural descendant of a favoured family; the other, as himself, the progenitor, because the Creator of him from whom, in common with that family of royal ancestry, though of de-crowned greatness, he had himself as man derived his manhood. The spirit of Prophecy, by this artificial alliance of symbols, in themselves, apparently incongruous, did herein contrive to set before the church, ere Jesus' birth, the wondrous mystery of *God manifest in the flesh*, the mighty and adorable Theanthrope, who has appropriated to himself, all that by those symbols was expressed, saying, "I am the root and offspring of David," (Rev. xxii. 16.) Turn now to the statement, in which this symbol is embodied—and in *THAT day*, when the fruit-bearing scion from Jesse's root shall exercise his righteous rule, slay the wicked one, and vindicate the meek; when the lower animals shall be at peace; when none shall hurt or destroy upon the holy mountain, and the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as a personal God, manifested

* See Appendix.

before the eyes of men; "In that day, there shall be the root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; of him shall the Gentiles oracularly enquire, and his resting place shall be glorious." When *he* attains to all this dignity and renown, who was once manifested as a mere Branch, he shall also be manifested as Jesse's root—the Almighty Creator of all men. If his coming forth, as a rod, out of Jesse's stump, denoted his actual manifestation to Israel, as the suffering Messiah; then, by every rule of right interpretation, when as Jesse's root, he shall become the gathering point of the peoples, according to that which was written of Shiloh, he must needs be manifested after the same manner to the Gentiles, as the object of their visible worship and willing obedience, from whom they may immediately obtain oracular responses, and the glory of whose resting place their very eyes may discern. We have before referred to the remainder of this chapter, as expressing the Lord's purpose *in that day*, to recover the remnant of Israel from all nations, to put an end to the envy between the two houses, vanquish their enemies before them, and make a highway for their return from Assyria in as marvellous a manner as he did before, when they came out of the land of Egypt.—Thus, literally, am I compelled to take all that in this chapter is written of the branch and root of Jesse, of the lower animals, and of Israel's future restoration. It requires no common ingenuity to construe all these statements into figure; and his imagination must be very active, who can give any thing approaching to a consistent interpretation of every verse, upon the principle, that it is not designed to convey the ideas, which are naturally suggested by its perusal. But if the reasoning be correct, which denies a literal interpretation to what is predicted of the lower animals, I know not in what way we should meet a Jew, who taking up Mr. Gipps' weapons, should argue, that it is too much to reason from the symbolical expressions of Jesse's branch and Jesse's root, that Messiah was to be both God and Man; that while the former denotes his lineage, the latter only respects the succour he shall yield to Jesse's family at an after period; or who, denying that Messiah is represented by either expression, should contrive to place some ingenious comment of his own upon the place, and plead his right to regard it in his own way, upon the ground of highly figurative language.—Yet, if there be a plain prophecy in Scripture, it is this very chapter, and if we have no right to interpret it literally, there is nothing literal in Scripture.

But we are told that, according to the same rule, we ought to interpret Isaiah lv. 12, 13, literally also. Let us therefore

examine this place.—“Ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree, and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign, that shall not be cut off.”—Here I find nothing of symbol; and making due allowance for obvious figure, I am not ashamed to own, that I am forced to give this statement a literal interpretation. Hills and mountains never possessed any more than they do now, vocal organs; nor were trees ever furnished any more than they are at present, with hands. Neither do I find in any part of Scripture, the slightest indication, that it is the Lord’s will at any future period, to transform hills and trees into organic matter, or to endow them with animal functions. I at once perceive, therefore, that the prophet has so far resorted to figure, and to figure of a very expressive and energetic kind.—The sombre hue of mountains, clothed with diluvial relics, in mourning, as it were, for the pristine beauty, with which they came forth from the Creator’s hand, rejoicing in the verdure of perpetual spring, shall be exchanged for the more becoming robe of festivity, when the world, at large, has laid aside the worn-out garments of the curse, and has joined in the general joy of Israel’s recovery, which shall be *as life from the dead*.—The leafy honours of the forest are now as nothing to what shall then be exhibited, and they shall then express their glad sense of that refreshing season, as audibly, as if they were furnished with hands. Their boughs shall answer every breeze of heaven that is borne onward with the echo of Israel’s joy. Thorns and briars, which were indebted for their propagation to the sin of man, shall be supplanted, when the year of the redeemed is come, by the fir-tree and the myrtle.—Such is the natural and literal sense of the Prophet, and let our lovers of figure, whose keen sense of the unnatural can convert it at once, into what best pleases their imagination or caprice, regard it in what light they may; and let them pronounce it accomplished by the meagre return of a local and persecuted body, across an ungenial and dreary desert from Babylon if they will; but for my own part, I dare not thus treat the word of the faithful and true witness, and must express my full agreement with what Houbigant has said.

“Hæc non convenire in reditum Babylone Judæorum, videbit quisquis perleget historiam sacram, imo quisquis hunc ipsum locum attente considerabit. Nam pollicetur Deus, quæ miracula reditum Judæorum comitabuntur, eorum miraculorum

vestigia nunquam deletum iri; quæ accommodari non possunt, nisi ad ultimum reditum Judæorum.”

“In Isaiah xxxv. 9,” writes Mr. Gipps, “it is said, ‘No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there.’ This is evidently connected with the coming of Christ, foretold in ver. 4; in the same way as Isa. xi. 6–8, was connected with his coming, as foretold in ver. 1 of *that* chapter. According to their own rule, they (millenarians) are bound to give a literal interpretation of ver. 9, and to understand it of real animals. They discard, however, their own rule in this case; and take these expressions, not in a literal but figurative sense; although the literal meaning is possible in this passage, according to the nature of things, and is *not* so in Isa. xi. 6–8”—I am not one of those Millenarians who discard the rule in this place. It is an important admission, which is made above, that this prediction is connected with the coming of Christ, foretold in ver. 4.—But the coming of Christ, which is foretold, is evidently his future coming; for at the first coming, the wilderness and the desert did not acquire the promised fertility, blossom or flourish luxuriantly *as the rose*; nor did streams of water gush forth to irrigate their arid soil; Lebanon, and Carmel, and Sharon, and the well watered plain of Jordan were not illuminated with *the glory of Jehovah*, nor beheld the *excellency*, or rather the *MAJESTY of our God*, for they were only trod by the weary feet of the man of sorrows, in whom there was no recognised comeliness; though some blind, deaf, dumb, and lame persons were then delivered—yet *the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the lame*, remained as distinct afflicted classes still; the haunts of dragons were not improved; and the ransomed of the Lord did not return to Zion,—To return there, they must have been its former occupants,—the Gentiles never were occupants, either of the Jerusalem which now is, or of that which is above, and is the mother of us all.—No restoration of Israelites took place, and the whole prophecy, the analysis of which we have thus negatively given, remains to be fulfilled. That portion of it, to which we have been referred, has inconsiderately been introduced into the inquiry before us, from the errors into which our translators have more especially fallen, owing to an undue deference to the authority of the Jews, who absurdly divided the eighth verse in the middle of a sentence, as noticed by Lowth. His version of the ninth and tenth verses I will now quote, along with Horsley’s of the eighth.—

8. And a causey, and a way shall be there,
And it shall be called the way of the Holy One.
The unclean shall not pass over it.

But He (that is, the Holy One) shall be with them, walking in the way.
And fools shall not go astray.*

9. No lion shall be there;
Nor shall the Tyrant of the beasts come up thither.
Neither shall he be found there;
But the redeemed shall walk in it.
10. Yea, the ransomed of JEHOVAH shall return,
They shall come to Zion with triumph;
And perpetual gladness shall crown their heads,
Joy and gladness shall they obtain,
And sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

I find no difficulty whatever in taking all this in a literal sense. I have no doubt whatever, that it ought to be so taken. We may spiritualize it if we will, and I have no objection to *accommodation*, when it is avowed to be *accommodation*. I believe we are fully justified in doing so. There is an intimate analogy between all the divine proceedings, whether of mercy or of judgment; and these analogies the inspiring Spirit continually delighteth to express in type, in symbol, in figure, in literal statement. Israel's future restoration is to be, *as in the day of Egypt*, which is at once the type of her approaching deliverance from the nations, under whose yoke she has passed, of the salvation of the elect, of their rescue from Satan, and of the final escape of the persecuted Church herself, from the gripe of Antichrist. What is said of the one, must therefore be true of the other, either in the way of type, or of antitype. That they who are now enjoying the present blessing, and the future hope of the Church, should seize on so beautiful a passage as this, as if it were wholly applicable to themselves, does not much surprise me. But it is undoubtedly of Israel, notwithstanding that these things are spoken here. A miraculous pathway shall be provided for Israel's return, (compare Isa. xi. 16.) which shall be called the pathway of the Holy One; since He shall be himself the guide of the happy travelers, who shall express the joyous feelings of their souls in the language of praise, as they pass along it to Zion. No Lion, literally, shall impede their path; and as to the Tyrant of the Beasts, he shall be unable to molest them, being himself secured in the bottomless pit. Our common version gave a colour, I admit, to the idea of mere figure being resorted to here, by the Prophet. The *pathway of holiness* might readily be supposed to denote the path of the just, or the holiness

* The eighth verse runs thus in the Breeches Bible of 1589. *And there shall be a path and a way, and the way shall be called holy; the polluted shall not pass by it; for he shall be with them and walke in the way, and the fooles shall not erre.* A marginal note on the words *he shall be with them*, thus interprets them; "God shal leade and guide them, alluding to the going forth of Egypt." —The same reading is retained, in the margin of Barker and Bill's Bible of 1630, "He shall be with them."

of their walk in life, which it would be impossible, in the nature of things, for ravenous or irrational creatures to tread. Yet, even under this impression, there might have lurked some suspicion of a right conception of the passage; for, though the path of the just shineth more and more, unto the perfect day, yet is it untrue to affirm concerning them, that they are unasailed in their pilgrimage, by wild passions, fierce temptations from the world, or the fiery darts of that evil one, who is here emblematically named the Tyrant of the Beasts. This name I apprehend, is conferred on him in allusion to the fact that he is the influencing director of the wild symbolic Beast, to whom he giveth *his power, his throne, and great authority*, Rev. xiii. 2.

Millenarians are next charged, but falsely, with a violation of their own rule, in the interpretation of Rev. xx. 4, 5, *first*, because they take *souls* there, to denote material *bodies*, "Upon their own rule," Mr. Gipps writes, "they are bound to interpret this, as foretelling a resurrection of the *souls*, because such a resurrection is possible, according to the nature of things, as described in various passages of Scripture, (Eph. ii. 5, 6, and v. 14, and Col. ii. 13, &c.*)" Could Mr. Gipps have been serious, when he wrote this? or could he have been ignorant of the fact, that in the grave, historical page of Scripture, without the smallest indication of figure, this same word *souls*, meets us perpetually, as synonymous with the word *persons*? Not to multiply quotations, I would ask, were the *three thousand souls*, who were added to the Church, on the occasion of Peter's discourse, at the day of Pentecost, disembodied Spirits, Acts ii. 41? or the two hundred, three score, and six souls, who were wrecked, with Paul, off Melita, were they also incorporeal beings, ship's company, centurion, and soldiers, all ghosts? It must *first* be proved, that such passages as these are figurative before the charge, which is brought against Millenarians for their interpretation of Rev. xx. 4, can justly lie at their door. To proceed to the next argument, "*Secondly*, If we take the literal meaning of the designation of those who *reign with Christ*, as signified in ver. 4, it would include only a very small number of the saints. This, therefore, would prove that ver. 4, cannot be intended to foretell the reigning with Christ after his second coming, because that will include *all* the saints; and consequently that the Millenarian view of the first resurrection, cannot be the true one." I have replied to this by anticipation, in my first letter, and shewn, from the structure of the Greek, and from the analysis of the whole passage, that this statement arises from an entire misconception of what is written. I only quote it now, lest I might be thought to evade its force on the one hand; and, on the other, that I may point

out, by the way, the fallacy of Mr. Gipps' unprecedented exposition of the place. According to him, those who *reign with Christ*, are not persons who have died, or have been martyred, and are risen again from the grave, after experiencing greater longevity than even Melchisedech, but persons who are to be martyred, and are to die. With him "the living and reigning of the persons there described, foretells their spiritual life, and reigning over the fear of man, and the errors and seductions of the beasts, over sin, and the world, &c." The *reigning with Christ*, then is only over "the fear of man," rather a curious subject, for the exercise of monarchical authority; and over "the errors and seductions of the beasts,"—what active service these can render their rulers, or how they are to express their homage, my knowledge of figure does not enable me to point out;—"over sin," to which the same remark applies;—and over "the world," this were a more tangible platform of empire, were the earth itself, with its inhabitants, included in the expression, which it is not, as used here by our author; while the "&c." if we were at liberty to interpret it largely, might include the universe, as it ought. But has it been overlooked that the *reigning with Christ* obviously implies a participation with him in his supreme authority, and is that authority only concerned in the suppression of evil propensities, in certain of the redeemed, at a particular epoch of the world? Alas, to what subterfuges are men reduced, who are unwilling to submit their judgments to the written word.

I proceed now to follow Mr. Gipps in his endeavour to ascertain, in accordance with certain rules, which he lays down, "in what sense the Holy Ghost uses the term resurrection, in Rev. xx. 4, 5. His rules are important. He would decide between a literal and figurative interpretation by considering, *first*, the general character of the book—*secondly*, the character of the context, especially the introduction of the passage—*thirdly*, the harmony of the interpretation with other unequivocal passages of Scripture.

First, the character of the book. In the case before us this is pronounced to be *figurative*. I have already shewn it to be symbolical. He refers for proof of its figurative character to Rev. vi. 12, because some writers, I suppose, owing to fanciful analogies they have thought proper to adopt, have determined this prophecy to have been fulfilled already, which, however, I take the liberty to deny. Yet fulfilled or unfulfilled, there certainly is figure here. The figures are expressed and undeniable, "the Sun became black *as* sack cloth of hair, and the moon became *as* blood, and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even *as* a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is

shaken by a mighty wind." The astronomical signs I understand to be *symbols*, the things to which they are likened, *figures*. Again, we are referred to the witnesses, Rev. xi. 4-12. It is taken for granted, that their *dead bodies*, *graves*, *standing on their feet*, &c. are figurative expressions, because some writers have so regarded them. I am not one of those, who so view them. I believe that all this will literally come to pass—that the Lord's real children, when this dispensation of testimony is brought to its close, will have to pass through martyrdom to their crown. But though these expressions were indeed figurative, they would not prove the book to be so. I find as many figures in the Gospel of St. John, to which we are referred, as a literal book. I there find Christ set forth as the *LIGHT* of the world, as the *brazen serpent*, as *bread*, a *door*, a *Shepherd*, a *Vine*, &c. And yet the Gospel of St. John is justly considered a literal book.

Secondly, "the introducing context."—This is pronounced to be "not literal, but figurative; John saw in vision, "an angel come down from heaven, having a key," and "a great chain in his hand—lay hold on a great dragon—bind him—cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up—set a seal upon him." John surely had this vision; he saw these things literally before his eyes;—The question is, what literal facts were they designed to symbolize? I believe there were never two opinions on the subject.—But even so, the book explains them.—On the word *chain*, we have already had some observations. If its import be plain in other places, and in ordinary compositions, I take it for granted, that it likewise is plain enough here. The dragon, who is forcibly arrested, and placed in hold, is unequivocally declared to be the Devil.—This is surely literal, if any thing be literal.—The *key* in the angel's hand, is a symbol that meets us in the vision of Jesus, as the Universal Bishop, in the first chapter. "I have the keys of Hades, and of death;" and again, in the epistle to Philadelphia, these things, saith he "that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth," Rev. iii. 7; where we have not only the symbol, but its import, the power of opening and of shutting. But there is a *seal* also used, to secure the old serpent. Resort was had to this device, to secure the sepulchre, and we can therefore be at no loss to understand its import here. He then who is deterred at the threshold by symbols, such as these; and deems from hence, the whole prophecy figurative, for the exposition of which, he may tax his own ingenuity, might as well close the book. The symbols are all self-evident—The great culprit is to be restrained—he is therefore, said to be

chained—The bottomless pit is to receive him—it must therefore be opened, and a *key* is provided—Escape is to be rendered impossible—the prison, therefore, is not only to be locked, but retributive justice affixes a seal which cannot be broken; unlike that vain thing, which Satan's agents aforetime attached to the tomb of Jesus. Such are the appropriate and intelligible symbols, which constitute the vision. The design of the incarceration, “that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled;” and the term of his confinement, *a thousand years*; and his subsequent enlargement, “after that, he must be loosed a little season;” are all expressed in common language. This running commentary on the vision, is no more figurative than what I am now writing. It is called, however “the introductory context.” I deem it rather a separate vision, the true introduction to which consists of the words following, *And I saw*.—It is certainly *related* to other visions, for of those who were seen by John, it is recorded “they lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years,” during *which* Satan was to remain bound; yet it is *independently* exhibited and expounded. Whether we regard, however, the true introduction, or the allied vision which precedes it, there is nothing which requires us to consider it as a highly wrought and figurative delineation of an unexpressed *somewhat*, for the discovery of which, we must either draw largely on our fancy, or employ no common share of logical ingenuity.—One great defect in this argument has been overlooked by Mr. Gipps.—It proves too much for his own scheme.—If this introductory context be all figure, bidding defiance to all literal interpretation; and if the succeeding vision, or prophecy of the first resurrection, must needs partake of the same unintelligible character; then must the concluding context, to which all this is introductory, be nothing else than figure also—the transactions, which it describes as taking place before the great white throne, must relate to any thing rather than the general judgment—and the committal of all, who were not written in the Book of Life, to the lake of fire, must be the description only of some national or ecclesiastical convulsion, revolution, or—*reformation* for aught I know.—In these days of rebuke and blasphemy and liberalism, revolution, by a new stride, which the march of mind has taken into the region of figure, has come to signify reformation.

Thirdly, the harmony of the interpretation with other unequivocal passages of scripture.—Under this head, Mr. Gipps at once determines, that the first resurrection cannot be taken “in a *material* sense, as referring to the resurrection of the bodies of the saints,” as such an interpretation would not har-

monize with the import he has attached to those numerous plain passages of Scripture, that have already passed under our review.—I might satisfy myself with the expression of a contrary conclusion, after what I have already written on the subject, were it not that I deem it expedient to examine it a little more minutely.—1st, I would observe, concerning the vision of the first resurrection, that there was but *one* symbol exhibited to the apostle's view, and that was *thrones*; the unnamed sitters upon the thrones are not even described symbolically; with them are associated *in rule*, the martyrs of all ages, and the faithful confessors of Christ, who rejected the delusions and opposed the authority of the beast.—2ndly, The remaining portion of the prediction, in perfect analogy with the running commentary on “the introductory context,” consists of plain unfigured prophecy. The absence indeed of symbol is so obvious throughout it, that those who would fain transform it into figure, invariably have recourse, like Mr. Gipps, to the introductory context for the discovery of symbol—If there be no symbol here, there is symbol there, and this becomes the basis of their allegation, that “all, all is figure!” A *throne* is so obvious a symbol, no obscurity is attached to it; of this, therefore, we hear little, and *that* the rather, as it would be somewhat dangerous to their own literal interpretation of the succeeding vision of the *white throne*, were they to involve this symbol in the common cloud of darkness, in which they endeavour to envelope the great mass of symbolic prophecy.—I say, the great mass, for with singular inconsistency, symbol is no obstruction in their way, when they come to expound the vision of the scarlet whore, as she rides the ten-horned beast; or to interpret any prophecy which can furnish them with an argument against the Papacy.—3dly, In this place I would point out the first express harmony which there exists between one verse in this prediction, and a plain, unequivocal statement in the book of Proverbs.—It is written, “but the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished,” ver. 5. I now turn to Prov. xxi. 16, and I there find the corresponding statement, “the man that wandereth out of the way of understanding, shall remain in the congregation of the dead.” Heb. the Rephaim, those who are to greet the mystic king of Assyria on his descent to Hades, Isa. xiv. 9, and who are in prison, *φυλακη*, safe keeping, 1 Pet. iii. 19, reserved *in chains* unto judgment, 2 Pet. ii. 4. Their *remaining* in the congregation of the dead would be, *in itself*,—and irrespectively of the punitive evils which they may experience in that condition—no greater privation than that, which befalls the whole mass of separate spirits, were their abode there, not to

be protracted beyond that of the righteous.—But protracted beyond that of the righteous, their abode shall be, and their condition there, precisely similar to that of Satan, as appears from the two places in Peter, to which I have referred, where we have the same expressions employed exactly which are used in Rev. xx.—for it is not only said of Satan, he shall be *chained*, but that he is to be loosed out of his own prison, or place of security, (ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ—ver. 7)—I observe, in passing, that the imprisoning of the messengers, or angels, who preserved not their principality, and are reserved in *chains*, are expressions which never led to the idea, that Peter's epistles are all figurative, though their occurrence in this prophecy has led to so much argument on the subject.—I now would direct attention to the symbol of the thrones, and those who sat on them.—I find this admirably harmonizes with Hanna's prayer.—“He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes and to make them inherit *the throne of glory*,” 1 Sam. ii. 8. These poor beggars, pensioners continually dependant upon the divine bounty, can be no other than the poor in spirit; who have discovered the humiliating fact, that, let their present circumstances be what they may, they are miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked—Possessing the unsearchable riches of Christ, they possess all things in promise, and reversion, poor though they be; and the throne they inherit, is the throne of the Messiah, (Rev. iii. 21,) under the whole heaven, and therefore over the whole earth, (Dan. vii. 27.) This will appear further, from considering the reason assigned by the inspiring Spirit in confirmation of this, their exaltation. “For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's and he hath set the world upon them,” (ver. 8.) This reference to the creative fiat can have no other meaning than this, that he who has established the earth, possesses the power and the right to govern, by whom he may; to give the government thereof,—to the poor, and to the beggar. He, himself, vindicates his own proceedings in providence, by an appeal to the same argument, (Job xxxviii. 4—7.) ‘The throne of glory, being the throne of the Messiah, must have its locality, in Jerusalem, according to Ps. ii. 6, and also, to that which is written (Jer. iii. 17,) “At that time they shall call Jerusalem the *throne* of Jehovah; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of Jehovah, to Jerusalem, neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their own evil heart.” Jerusalem is also so named in the penitential confession, hereafter to be used. “Do not abhor us for thy name's sake; do not disgrace the *throne of thy glory*,” (Jer. xiv. 21.) Further it is said, “a *glorious high throne* from the beginning, is the

place of our sanctuary. (Jer. xvii. 12.) It may be said, that all these expressions relate to the theocracy, under which the Jews were once placed. But not to refer again, to the prophecies concerning Messiah's right to, and future possession of David's throne, I observe that the circumstances of Israel, were all typical of a future state of things, when the throne of Jesus, being established in Jerusalem, Jehovah shall be king over all the earth. What was once adumbrated by the glory in the sanctuary, shall be then realized, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory. I find a statement in every respect parallel to that of Hanna's, in (Ps. cxiii.) that splendid Hallel, which shall be sung, when Jehovah's name shall be blessed from that time, even for evermore; when his name shall be praised, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same—when he shall be high above all nations, and his glory above the heavens. Condescending to behold the things that are in heaven, and in earth, he shall then "raise the poor out of the dust, and lift the needy out of the dung-hill, that he may set him with princes, even with the princes of his people." His people are the Jews, and who can these princes of the Jews be, amongst whom, the poor and needy are to take their co-equal stations, except the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the Apostles—those twelve who are to sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel? But the last words of the psalm, which follow those just quoted, pin down their exaltation of the poor and needy, to the locality of Canaan, and the period of Israel's blessedness. *He maketh THE BARREN WOMAN to keep house* (or rather cause it to be inhabited), *and to be a joyful mother of children. Hallelujah.* Poor Judah has long since learned, and that most justly, to view herself, as the barren woman, hereafter to be blessed with a most abundant progeny. The Targum thus interprets the place; "who makes the congregation of Israel, which is like to a barren woman, that sitteth sorrowful, to dwell with the man of her house, full of multitudes." Long repudiated for her incontinence, and spiritual fornication, she shall be restored to the full enjoyment of all her conjugal rights, by her Maker, who is himself her husband. So are we taught, not by the Targum, but by that infallible expositor, who has penned his own mind, by his well instructed scribe Hosea, as at large set forth in the book of his prophecy; and who has thus further expressed it by the mouth of his servant Isaiah.—"Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife," (or Gentile Church, by which her place was supplied for a season,) "saith the

Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth (“sobolesces,” Houbigant, “burst forth with increase,” Lowth) on the right hand and on the left; *and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles,** and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed; neither be thou confounded for thou shalt not be put to shame, for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, (her incontinence) and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood (her punishment) any more. For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of Hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel. The God of the whole earth, shall he be called. For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken, and grieved in spirit, (how like unto Hannah, her appointed type,) and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee,” (Isa. liv. 1-7.) In the conclusion of that memorable recapitulation of the Lord’s goodness, and wonderful works, for the grateful confession and acknowledgment whereof by the children of men, the inspiring spirit expresses such reiterated desire, (Ps. cvii. 40-43,) the downfall of earthly princes, and the exaltation of the poor, in their room, is predicted. “He poureth contempt upon princes, and causeth them to wander in the wild place, where there is no way. Yet, setteth he the poor on high, after affliction, and maketh Him, (Messiah, personal, and mystical,) families like a flock. The righteous shall see it, and rejoice; and *all* iniquity shall stop her mouth.” This hath not all iniquity done yet.—She is more vociferous, and foul-mouthed than ever.—Soon, however, shall she be silent in darkness.—She shall go into the trackless waste with the confederate princes of Antichrist, when the righteous, with joy, shall behold the triumph, and participate in the glory of the exalted One; when he shall succeed to the crown of all the earth, whose princes are laid prostrate in the dust; and when “the final restoration from the dispersion,” shall take place, as a “Thanksgiving,” for which, as Horsley rightly judged, this Psalm was composed. “Whoso is wise, and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord.” May we be given grace to ponder them aright; and never be unmindful of the kindred promise addressed to us, in the opening of the Apocalypse, (Rev. i. 3.) Recurring now to Hannah’s prayer, I find

* “Here the person addressed is clearly distinguished, from the Gentiles, which shewed that the Hebrew Church, not the Church of the Gentiles is intended.”—Horsley in loco.

the exaltation of the poor similarly connected with the overthrow of the rebel rout and the establishment of Messiah's kingdom.—“He will keep the feet of his Holy One and the wicked shall be silent in darkness; for by strength no man shall prevail. The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall he thunder upon them.—*Jehovah* shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his King, and exalt the horn of his Messiah.”—“The king, of whom Hannah speaks,” says D. Kimchi, “is the Messiah”—He could be no other.—There was at this time no king in Israel.—My task would never end, were I to produce all the proofs which are at hand, to establish the general harmony of Scripture, with Rev. xx. 4–9. I must therefore content myself with a reference to those places which Mr. Gipps has mentioned.

1. Zech. xiv. 1–11. We have here a description of THE DAY OF THE LORD. It is to be marked by the destruction of the assembled nations, who went forth against Jerusalem; by *Jehovah's* going forth against them; by his taking his station on Mount Olivet, which shall then divide in twain; by the coming of all his saints along with him; by his acquisition of the undisputed sovereignty of earth; and by the safe re-occupation of Jerusalem by its rightful possessors.—Mr. Gipps imagined that the earth would immediately be burnt up on the appearing of Christ, and he therefore concluded, that this going forth of the Lord, and this coming of Messiah, must either be a figurative coming, or else, his first coming as embracing its results. If the earth was to be burned up at the moment of his coming in glory, it would be quite impossible that these events could then take place on its surface.—But let it be even granted, that 2 Pet. iii. contains no one symbolical allusion, yet, does it not contain a single syllable to justify the idea that the earth and the heavens should be burned up at the very moment of his coming. The conflagration, indeed, is identified with *the day of the Lord*; but so also is this very chapter of Zechariah; and if it be plain, from this latter place, that *that* day is connected with a series of occurrences, which are to take place on the surface of the earth, leading to the safe inhabitation of Jerusalem, and the periodical celebration of the feast of Tabernacles by all the families of the earth; then does it needs follow, that the day of the Lord denoteth a long season, and not a day of four and twenty hours only in duration. Again, Mr. Gipps imagined, incorrectly, as we have seen, that all the ungodly will be destroyed when “the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire,” 2 Thess. i. 7; and he therefore argued, that this must be a different coming

of Messiah which is predicted, because “ungodly persons remain after *this* going forth of the Lord, in open enmity and rebellion against him and his people, and subsequently fight against Jerusalem, ver. 12–15, 18, 19.” The two latter verses indeed, prove, that ungodly persons will remain after this going forth of the Lord, because their punishment will be inflicted for their refusal to worship **THE KING**, *the Lord of Hosts*; but not so the former, for while it follows the description of the going forth of Jehovah, it is but a more detailed account of the manner in which he shall smite the gathered nations, when he shall come, attended by his saints. To these considerations he added, what he called, the absurdity of supposing that Christ would thus *fight* in person,—an exceedingly bad mode of reasoning, as applied to revelation;—and that nations of ungodly men, in their present bodies, would fight against him.—Had he weighed the statement, “then shall Jehovah go forth and fight against those nations, *as when he fought in the day of battle*,” the day of Egypt, the grand type of this great crisis would have been recalled to his recollection—he would have remembered the precedent afforded for this madness, by the impious precipitation with which the enemies then rushed against the bosses of the Almighty’s buckler, when, from the dread pillar of fire he frowned upon their daring hosts.—“Moses said unto the people, in that day, Fear ye not, stand still and see the salvation of the Jehovah, which he will show to you to day; for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to day, ye shall see them again no more for ever. *Jehovah shall fight for you*, and ye shall hold your peace.” (Exod. xiv. 13, 14.) “And it came to pass, that in the morning watch, Jehovah *looked* unto the host of the Egyptians, through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians; and took off their chariot wheels that they drave them heavily; so that the Egyptians said, let us flee from the face of Israel, for Jehovah fighteth for them against the Egyptians,” (ver. 23, 24.) Lastly, Mr. Gipps took it for granted, that the word *day, night, evening, light, waters*, in ver. 6, 7, 8, were all figures, and therefore judged himself at liberty, upon the principle combated already in the commencement of this letter, to pronounce the whole prophecy *all figure*, that is quite unintelligible.—And, in truth, this chapter must be wholly unintelligible to those, who deny the doctrine of the first resurrection, and the Saviour’s future reign on earth. But I deny that the expressions above referred to, are figures.—Following our own version, the intermediate period between the thick-darkness of night, and the full blaze of meridian day, corresponding precisely with the morning watch,

when Jehovah looked forth on the Egyptians, is pointed out as the period, when the Messiah shall break in on the fancied security of the assembled nations. However, archbishop Newcome renders it thus,

6. And it shall come to pass in that day,
There shall not be a bright light and darkness;
7. But there shall be one day.
This is known unto Jehovah.
There shall not be day, and there shall not be night,
But it shall come to pass, that, at eventide, there shall be light.

Fry, who follows Newcome, says, "The meaning I take to be simply this; at the time predicted, as far as regards the holy mountain of the Lord's house, there shall no longer be the ordinary vicissitudes of day and night." "There shall not be *brightening light*, neither shall there be *condensing darkness*," but all shall be one entire day; not day and night as now—or as then, perhaps, to the rest of the earth—but at the time of even, light shall appear to shine, even the glory of Jehovah. This is parallel to Isaiah, lx."* Of the literal character of the waters, I entertain no doubt.

II. Luke xx. 34–36. "The children of this age marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that age, and the resurrection that out of dead ones, *τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν* [when they shall rise, Mark] neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are *ἰσάγγελοι* equal unto the angels, (angel-like, Campbell) (*ὡς ἄγγελοι* Matthew and Mark, *as angels*) and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Matthew, who omitteth in his record of this discourse, what is said above of those, who are worthy to obtain that age, and the resurrection out of the dead ones, here addeth, "but as touching the resurrection of the dead; have you not read that which was spoken unto you, by God, saying, &c." Instead of the substantive *ἀναστάσις*, in this sentence, the Evangelists, Mark and Luke, substitute the verb *ἐγείρονται*, "as touching the dead *that they rise*.—Now that the dead *are raised*; even Moses shewed you in the bush, when he calleth the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." All the dead, of whom the Lord is God, must be raised, for this is involved in the very mystery of the name of God אלהים. In this Title is included the necessity of bringing forth life out of death, of reviving those whom he hath slain. "See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no God with me," literally "standing by me," that is, united with me, or giving me aid, "I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal," (Deut. xxxii.

* Fry, on Second Advent, vol. ii. p. 122.

39.) "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive," (1 Sam. ii. 6.) Therefore was it, that being instructed in the mystery of this name, the king rent his clothes, on the Syrian's application to him to heal Naaman of his leprosy, saying, "am I God to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?" (2 Kings v. 7.) He who killeth, and maketh alive, is the God of all men, and therefore shall all men be raised, but every man in his own order. This truth is involved in the very name by which the Lord revealed himself, in the bush, for he is not the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob only; and when Christ therefore, appealed to this name, in proof of the resurrection out of dead ones, he was of necessity, led to suggest the doctrine of the general resurrection. So obviously however, was the resurrection out of the dead ones, limited to the angel-like just, the co-ordinate messengers, the children of God, in the commencement of his reply to the Sadducees, as above given, that even Campbell's note on those who are worthy to share it, attempts thus strangely to account for it. "It may be remarked in passing, that our Lord, agreeably to the Jewish style of that period, calls that only *the resurrection*, which is a resurrection to glory." The shifts to which men resort, are very surprising. Truly derogatory to our Lord, would it have been, had he in compliance with any erring form of speech, lent the countenance of his authority, even by implication, to any false impression, which existed in the popular mind. In combating one error, he could never have insinuated his agreement with another. But the Jewish style, in speaking of the resurrection at that period, was, in fact, far more evangelical than Mr. Campbell's; and they understood the character of it better, for they fully believed that the patriarchs in particular, and the righteous in general, would arise from the dead, and be put in possession of Canaan.* This they regarded as the resurrection out of dead ones; and when our Lord adopted this phraseology, he sanctioned also their doctrine. They gathered from the promises to Abraham, and his seed, that the friend of God, and all his righteous descendants, would arise from the dead in the days of the Messiah, and inherit Canaan. So strong was this impression on their minds, and so just was their reasoning on the subject, that Mede contends our Lord's argument in favour of the resurrection, from Jehovah's title as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, can only be understood when it is regarded as involving a direct reference to the covenant established with each of those Patriarchs, to put them in personal

* See T. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 90-2.

possession of the land of promise.* And it surely was thus that he revealed himself to them, as the God, who maketh alive. Now, I do put it to the common sense of the Church, whether our Lord would have employed language so liable to misconstruction, when addressing such an audience, if he had not designed to corroborate the judgment of the Jewish Doctors? While he spends all his shafts upon the Sadducees he not only directs none upon the subject, against the Pharisees, but tacitly, and by positive statements, allows it to be understood, that he is the supporter of their views. Not a single sentence has been left on record, as uttered by him, in reprehension of that view of the resurrection, which, by the Pharisees was entertained. He appears always as their advocate in this matter; as did his Apostles after him. Very memorable was the course taken before the council, by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. "When Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the counsel, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and *resurrection of dead ones*, I am called in question," Acts xxiii. 6. The *resurrection of dead ones*, (not *τῶν νεκρῶν* of the dead,) in the Pharasaic sense, was secured by, as the example was also given *in*, the resurrection of our Lord, from the Sepulchre. Whether, therefore, I consider the argument of the Lord; the opinions of the Jews, concerning the resurrection of the Patriarchs, and of the just out of the dead, to which his sanction was given; or the very language he employed, *the resurrection that out of dead ones*; I am compelled to believe that the righteous shall arise out of the mass of the dead, in order to enjoy *that age*, which is peculiarly the age or dispensation or millennial reign of Messiah. A portion of this argument would indeed be vitiated, were Mr. Gipps' statement borne out, "although *the resurrection from the dead*, in Luke xx. 35, refers, I conceive, to the resurrection of blessedness of the Saints, yet, as the same discourse is recorded in Matt. xxii. 29-32, and as the same resurrection, is there noticed, (ver. 31,) as the *resurrection of the dead*, without the preposition *ex*, we could not, I conceive, infer that the Holy Ghost intended any stress to be laid upon the use of the preposition, in Luke xx. 35, or it would certainly have occurred in Matt. xxii. 31, also." From the analysis I have above given of both evangelists, it appears, that the supplementary words given by Matthew, relate to another resurrection altogether, or rather to the resurrection in general. The fact of a resurrection of all men, being established, it follows at once, that the particular resurrection of the just to the enjoyment of

* See Mede's Letter to Dr. Twiss; Works, Book iv. Let. xliii.

that age, will take place. This at once accounts for the words we meet with in St. Matthew, and which are omitted by St. Luke.

III. It has been likewise attempted to evade the force of the preposition, *ἐκ*, *of*, *or out of*, as it occurs in Acts iv. 2. "And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees, came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached *through Jesus the resurrection that out of dead ones*," *τὴν ἀναστάσιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*. This, it is said, does not relate "to the resurrection of believers only. For 1st. Jesus will raise the ungodly as well as the godly" (John v. 28, 29). But here the question is not *what he will do*, but *what the apostle said* he would do; and 2nd. The resurrection which the apostle preached, *appears* to be connected with the destruction of the ungodly: compare chapter iii. 23. We proceed to show, from the preceding discourse, that *what they spake unto the people* was in perfect accordance with the Millenarian view; that they did not speak of the resurrection of the ungodly or of their ultimate destruction, and that they did speak of the first resurrection. What the apostles, Peter and John, thus spake related to the cure of the lame man, who sat for alms at the Beautiful gate of the temple. This miracle of healing, they ascribed to the Prince of Life, whom God had *raised from the dead*, *ἡγείρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, *out of dead ones*; and then ascribing the crucifixion of the Messiah to the ignorance of the multitude and of their rulers, thus exhorted them, chapter iii. 19.

19. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, that the times of reanimation may come from the presence of the Lord; 20, and that he may send Jesus Christ, *προκεχειρισμένον* the before designed for you, whom the heaven must receive [contain] until the seasons of re-establishing of all things, which God hath spoken of by the mouth of all his holy prophets from the age. 22, For Moses truly said unto the Fathers—A prophet shall the Lord your God, (*ἀναστήσει*) raise up unto you, (*ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν*), out of the brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. 23, And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be exterminated out of the people (*ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ*). 24, Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of THE DAYS, THOSE, (*τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης*.) 25, Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant, which God confirmed to our fathers, saying unto Abraham—And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. 26, God, having raised up, (*ἀναστήσας*), his own Son

Jesus, hath sent him to you first blessing you, in the turning back each of you from your iniquities.”

The resurrection, that out of dead ones, referred to in this searching exhortation, is identified with the seasons of re-animation, and re-establishing of all things, when that Jesus, whom heaven must retain till then, shall return, according to the covenant made with Abraham, to bless all the *families*, (*πατριάι*), OF THE EARTH. All the prophets have spoken of the general resurrection. He must, therefore, come before the general resurrection to re-establish all things, in the times of re-animation. His future coming when all that the Prophets have spoken shall be accomplished, will be thus marked by a resurrection—an *ἀναψυξις*—but it will be the resurrection, *that*, out of dead ones. He was first raised up as a Prophet like unto Moses, to bless the Jews by turning each of them from their iniquities. His being thus raised up as a Prophet, it would seem, was allusive to his exaltation as such to the right hand, as well as to his selection from the brethren and appointment to the office. His testimony, however, as a Prophet, was not to receive entire credence, and they who wilfully rejected it were to be exterminated, as history tells us they most miserably were. But the multitude was assured on this occasion, that though in ignorance they had not embraced his instructions, when personally addressed to them, the extermination would not ensue straightway unless they now rejected the testimony concerning him, refused the present blessing, and continued in iniquity. But on the contrary, that the return of the Lord Jesus was in some sort dependant, so to speak, on the repentance of their nation. Such is the fair and obvious bearing of the whole exhortation. But I observe further, that we have here three remarkable examples of the use of the preposition *ex*, *out of*. 1. The Prince of Life was raised *out of* the dead ones; 2. The Prophet like to Moses was raised *out of* the brethren; 3. The obdurate rejectors of Messiah were to be exterminated *out of* the people. In each of these cases it is expressly implied that the parties referred to were respectively severed from the mass to which they belonged.—The crucified Redeemer was separated from the dead—the anointed Prophet from the brethren—and the obstinate revolvers from the people. Strange would it be indeed, if the same preposition, when used two verses after this discourse, should have lost its property and have ceased to convey the same idea! There would be nothing definite in language if *the resurrection that out of dead ones* did not imply a severing of some out of the mass of the dead, that they might be distin-

guished as the children of the resurrection, while the residue continued in the state of death.

IV. Though the words *out of*, when applied to a thing or a person taken from a mass, necessarily exclude the notion of universality, yet great would be the paucity of language, if it were incapable of expressing the same idea without the use of this expression. Very inconclusive, therefore, is the following reasoning:—"The xv. chapter of 1 Cor. treats, as these writers allow," you have already perceived I am not of the number, "only of the resurrection of *those who are Christ's* (ver. 24). In this we have the word resurrection in connexion with *νεκρῶν of the dead*, in four verses; namely, 12, 13, 21, 42. If, therefore, there was any foundation for the argument, we should certainly find, that in each and all of these verses, the preposition *ex* would occur. Instead of this it does not occur in one of them." Passing by the fallacy in this syllogism, I turn to these verses and I find them particularly confirmatory of the argument. *Now if Christ be preached that he rose, ex νεκρῶν, out of dead ones*, (an undeniable example of the true use of the preposition. Comp. 1. Pet. i. 3.) "how say some among you that there is not a resurrection of dead ones? But if there be not a resurrection of dead ones, then is Christ not risen." Some amongst these Corinthians, the false teachers, &c. had proceeded to greater lengths than modern spiritualizers have done, and denied, in the true Sadducean spirit, any resurrection at all. With them he argues the question and shows that if the idea of a resurrection is to be regarded as an impossible, absurd, or carnal thing, then it would equally have been so in the case of Christ, that the doctrine of his resurrection would have been fabulous, and that the whole superstructure of Christianity would, necessarily, fall to the ground. But having shewn, upon irresistible evidence, that his resurrection had taken place, he thence draws the conclusion that he had risen as the first fruits of the sleepers, "for since by man the death, so by man resurrection of dead ones; for as in the Adam all die, even so in the Christ shall all be made alive. But every one in his own order," &c. While he establishes the doctrine of a resurrection of all, he takes care to discriminate between the respective epochs at which the several bands shall arise, thus resorting to a more unequivocal form of speech, than if he had even adopted the formula elsewhere met with, viz.—*the resurrection that out of dead ones*. Thus we perceive, that however meagre language may be, in man's use of it, the Holy Ghost knoweth how to render it expressive, and is not restricted to any one mode of conveying an idea through such a channel, imperfect as it is. Returning again to the general

doctrine of a resurrection, which he illustrates by a reference to the uprising of vegetable substances from decayed seeds; and strengthens by contrasting the existing varieties of animal flesh, of mortal and of immortal bodies, with the widely differing character of the luminous orbs of heaven, he proceeds to add—"So also is the resurrection of the dead," ver. 42. Now had he here written, "so also is the resurrection out of dead ones," he would have excluded the resurrection of the unjust, and have left his argument imperfect. The absence of the preposition here is, therefore, in my judgment, a convincing proof of its true force where it is really employed.

V. Phil. iii. 11. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection from the dead," Vulgate & *Douay*. Though I dispute the idea attached to *ἐξανάστασις* of *outrising from the grave*, I am not unwilling to admit the *general* law, laid down by Mr. Gipps, that where prepositions of motion *ἐκ*, *ἐξ*, or *ἀπο*, occur in composition with a substantive, they do not govern the genitive which follows, but some other substantive understood, or as his words are, "the sense of the preposition does not belong to the genitive case, which follows, but to some substantives understood." But why may not, *νεκρῶν*, the dead, be the substantive understood here as well as Hades *ᾧδου*? Now the fact is, I believe, there is no substantive understood. I agree with Dr. Hales, that the preposition here is intensive, and that the word *ἐξανάστασις* denotes the extraordinary resurrection—just as *ἐκδεχομένων* denotes the extraordinary anxiety, with which the multitude of diseased persons at Bethesda's pool, awaited the stirring of the water, John v. 3;—as *ἐξουθενήσῃ* signifies that thorough disregard, as if he were no one, with which Paul forbids the Corinthians to view Timothy; but addeth he, "conduct him forth in peace for I wait with extraordinary anxiety, *ἐκδέχομαι*, for him with the brethren," 1 Cor. xvi. 11;—and as *ἐξετάσατε*, *search diligently*, signifies the extraordinary diligence, with which Herod exhorted the wise men to seek the young child at Bethlehem. Math. ii. 8. But lest there might be some magic in a substantive thus compounded and followed by a genitive, I present you with the following example: "and shall not God *ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ* execute the extraordinary avengement of his own extraordinarily chosen ones, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them. I tell you that he will execute the extraordinary avengement of those very ones speedily," *τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν ταχείᾳ*. Luke xviii. 7, 8. These quotations, which might be greatly multiplied, fully establish the sense, which I annex to the word (*ἐξανάστασις*.) But the sentence in which it occurs, requires that it should denote something more than a mere

resurrection. It is certain that all men, whatever their character may have been, will arise from the grave; but the very language that Paul employs here denotes that the resurrection to which he desires to attain, is by no means secure to all men, and it must therefore be some particular or extraordinary resurrection. I have above intimated that *outrising* is not and cannot be the literal import of ἐξαναστασις. When it was so expressed it must have been forgotten that a second preposition enters into the composition of this word, which signifies *again*, so that were we to render it according to the full force of its component parts, we should employ the periphrasis, *the rising again out of*. The primitive idea attached to the preposition *ex* in composition, when it becomes *intensive*, we may possibly arrive at, by examining its employment, in the word ἐξαδελφος a nephew, one who cometh out of the loins of a brother, a graft, an excision from a brother, where the sense of the preposition is reflective, or belongs to the word brother, with which it is conjoined. A viceroy, by allowable fiction, being regarded as one, who had proceeded *out of* the supreme ruler, was, in like manner styled an Ex-arch, ἐξαρχος. In one was centered a brother's nature, and a brother's likeness, and in the other was centered, as it were, the imperial dignity and power. Thus an *Ex-anastasis*, or extraordinary resurrection, is the centered outgoing of the whole resurrection, represented in the outraged Saints, who are the first fruits unto God, and the Lamb. As this word does not occur elsewhere, it is the more difficult to establish its import. But we meet with a kindred expression, in 1 Cor. vi. 14. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ τὸν Κυρίον ἡγείρε καὶ ὑμᾶς ἐξήγρει. "But God hath both raised the Lord, and will out-raise, or pre-eminently raise you." That the word (ἐξήγρει) possesses this intense force, can admit of no doubt, when we find it employed thus remarkably in Rom. ix. 27; "the scripture saith unto Pharoah, even for this same purpose, have I raised thee up, ἐξηγήρα σε remarkably elevated thee, that I might shew my power in thee." While for the sake of argument, I have admitted Mr. Gipps' rule, concerning the force of the compounded prepositions of motion, I would just add, that the general sense of the passage, must ever determine the import of the word.—For instance ἀποβανειν τὸν ἵππου is good Greek, to express the act of alighting from a horse, and no Grecian could understand it to express the act of the horse itself, in alighting, unless indeed, the context proved that the horse, and not the rider, was the descending animal. According to this view of the subject, therefore, if it can be proved, as I consider it can, from Rev. xx. 4. and other places, that the just shall arise, to reign with Christ on earth, before the general resurrection, I

know no law of interpretation, which can forbid our understanding the (*outrising of dead ones*) ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν with many eminent Greek scholars, as for instance, the author of the letters signed *Basilicus*, as importing the resurrection out of dead ones, if it should be preferred to that, for which I have argued, and which amounts to precisely the same thing, in the end.

VI. Twelve pages of Mr. Gipps' *third* chapter are devoted to prove, that the resurrection of the just will be distinguished from that of the unjust according to his own theory, in a way of transcendant blessing, which would be sufficient to account as he judged for the strong language employed, Luke xiv. 14; xx. 35, 36; Phil. iii. 11; Heb. xi. 35. I feel it, however, quite needless to follow him, and certainly do not design to pursue the system unfolded in his *fourth* and *fifth* chapters. I fear I have already wearied you with my remarks, and have no desire to trespass longer on your patience. I would, however, just observe, that it is not enough to prove, that the parties, who arise, will be distinguished from each other; but that it is also necessary to demonstrate that the resurrection in which they respectively will obtain a part is distinct also, before it can be possible to evade the force of the above places. May we, dear brother, and all for whom we are interested, obtain a part in the first resurrection.

APPENDIX.

Kilcoleman Parsonage,
17th March, 1832.

I need offer no apology for requesting your attention to a more connected expression of what I believe to be the mind of the spirit in Rom. viii. 19, 23, than the unexpected discussion, extreme nervousness, and much interruption enabled me to do at our late meeting. This, I shall endeavour to attempt in as brief a way as possible, and in the words of others, as far as possible, rather than my own. As the question hinges on the meaning of the word *κτίσις* creature or creation, I will first try to ascertain its proper sense.

I remember to have stated, that the word *κτίσις* never signifies the *new creation* without the addition of the word *new*. I have since justified the remark by reference to *Schmidii Concordantia*. The word exactly occurs *nineteen* times in the New Testament.

Three times in Mark, viz. chap. x. 6.—xiii. 19—xvi. 15.

In the two former it manifestly signifies the *visible* creation. In the last it *may* denote merely the *intelligent* creation, but the true rendering is, “*going into the whole world announce the glad tidings for the whole creation;*” and I believe it to refer to the *material* creation also. For Christ has redeemed the *material*, out of which man’s body was made, as well as the *immaterial*.

Seven times in Rom. i. 20, 25—Rom. viii. 19, 20, 21, 22, 39.

The two verses in the first chapter, and verse 39 in chapter viii. plainly describe the *visible* creation. The remaining verses are those at present in dispute.

Twice in Colossians, viz. i. chap. i. 15.

The first begotten of every creature. If we read *πρωτότοκος* instead of *πρωτότοκος*,* (which is indeed no various reading, our

* Homer uses it in the sense of *πρωτογενος*. I quote the following remarks from Isidorus Pelusiot, Lib. iii. Ep. 31. *Ophelio Grammatico*. “*Tristis ac pervulgatis omissis, aperte, quod sentio, dicam; etiam si quibusdam videri possim novam interpretationis viam inire, ὁ πρωτότοκος† (id est primogenitus) si secunda syllaba acuatur, eum qui primus natus est, significat. Si autem pe-*

† Omitti potest in interpret.

MSS. being without accents,) the true rendering will be *the first producer of the whole creation*. This is plain from the words which follow, furnishing us as they do, with the proof of this title of Messiah, *For by him were all things created, &c.*

Again, chap. i. 23.—*Which was preached to every creature which was under heaven*. The gospel had not been preached to every individual under heaven. It should be rendered preached *in* or “through the whole creation under heaven.” This establishes the true meaning of Mark xvi. 15.

nultima, eum qui primum genuit. Atque id vobis presertim, quos Homeri lectio delectat, compertum et exploratum est. *πρωτοτεκνισα* enim, ea quæ primum peperit, ab ipso dicta est. Probabile itaque, imo necessarium fuerit animadvertere, hujusmodi quodam sensu hic quoque divinum Paulum usum fuisse, cum Christum omnis creaturæ primogenitum dixit. Hoc quippe vocabulo non eum primum ex omnibus rebus conditis creatum esse docet, (absit) quippe qui splendorem gloriæ, et paternæ substantiæ characterem ipsum appellet verum eum res conditas primo peperisse, hoc est effecisse: ita ut (tertia syllaba acuto accentu notata) *πρωτογονος* non *πρωτογενος* i. e. primogignens, non primogenitus, *πρωτοκτιστης* non *πρωτίκτιστος* id est, primo creans, non primo creatus. Quod autem *ὁ τῶς* hoc loco pro creatione accipiatur, non est quod quisquam miretur, cum alio etiam loco dictum sit, Deum, qui te genuit, dereliquisti. Atque alio item, Filios genui, et exaltavi. Ac rursum, Ego dixi, Dii estis et filii excelsi omnes. Quonian enim et cum Deus genuit, citra passionem ullam genuit, et cum creat, citra omnem passionem, et modo divinitati consentaneo, ac sine ullo labore creat, idcirca Scriptura his vocabulis usa est, non ut per generationem creationem, et per creationem generationem intelligamus, (quemadmodum improbe ac veteratorie hæretici affirmare videntur) sed ut facilitatem, Deique ab omni perpeffione vacuitatem ostendat. Quod si quis ei dumtaxat, qua prius ipsius animus imbutus est, opinioni addictus, ac non veritatem sibi ante oculos proponens verbis meis refragetur, nec mihi ipse iudex ero, nec item ipsum sibi ipsi iudicem esse æquum fuerit. Quocirca incorruptis iudicibus negotium committamus, ac nostræ disputationis arbitri sint auditores. Itaque si ille aliquid demonstrare queat, demonstret. Sin autem a me demonstrationem exigit, hunc ipsum qui his verbis usus est, testem proferam. Postquam enim dixit Primogenitus omnis creaturæ, mox hæc verba subjunxit, Quoniam in ipso creata sunt omnia, quæ in cælis sunt et quæ in terra. Quamobrem si dixit, Post eum creata sunt, quin secundum adversariam pronuncietis, causam haud dico. Si autem, in ipso (etenim in Creatore rerum omnium procreatio et conservatio est. Quod quidem etiam alio loco explanans, dixit, In ipso enim vivimus, et movemur, et sumus) sine controversia, ut opinor, nostra est victoria. Quod si ea etiam, quæ sequuntur narravero, luculentius adhuc trophæum erit. Ait enim, Et ipse est ante omnia. Non dixit, Ipse factus est ante omnia, sed, Est ante omnia. Et omnia in ipso constituta sunt. Non dixit, Cum ipso nec, Post eum creata sunt—Quid autem est quamobrem eos rejiciunt, qui eum divinitatis ratione unigenitum dictum esse aiunt, humanæ autem naturæ respectu primogenitum omnis creaturæ? Nam si nec ita intelligatur, nec item *πρωτοκτιστης* vocetur, primogeniti vox, siquidem unigenito copuletur, nobilitatem designare potest (potest enim quispiam et primogenitus et unigenitus filius esse) si autem rebus creatis, oculum non habet. Aut enim *μικτιστος*, id est, solus creatus aut primogenitus erit. Alterutrum enim alterutrum de medio tollit. Quid autem prohibebat, quo minus aperte ipse diceret, *πρωτοκτιστος* omnis creaturæ. Jam si *πρωτοκτιστος*, i. e. primus creatus intelligatur, quonam pacto unigenitus est? Nam quod solum est, aliud haudquaquam admittit. Ac primum item solum repudiat. Quidnam autem juxta hoc ipsum rebus conditis præstat, si ipse quoque creatus est? Quin autem erubescunt, creaturam adorantes, ac suismet ipsi sententiis adversantes; quippe qui, cum res creatas adorari vetent,

Twice in Hebrews, viz. chap. iv. 12, which I translate,

“Even creation is not unexposed to his view; but all things,” evidently throughout nature, “are naked and open to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.”

“There is not a creature, all things created. That is, every creature whatever, whether they be persons, or things, angels, men, devils, professors, persecutors, all men of all sorts, and all things concerning them.” *Owen in loco.*

Chap. ix. 11.—The tabernacle, of which Christ is the High Priest, is not of *this creation*. In both these places the visible creation is spoken of.

Once in 1 Peter, chap. ii. 13.

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man. The Greek is “every human creation.” Macknight adds, to supply the sense, “of magistrates,” they are appointed by man; but, being elevated by the providence of God, are to be submitted to. Leighton says, “although civil authority in regard of particular forms of government, and the choice of persons to govern, is but a human ordinance or man’s creature, as the word is, yet both the good of government, and the duty of subjection to it, is God’s ordinance, and therefore, for *his sake*, submit yourselves.

Once in 2 Peter, viz. chap. iii. 4.

From the beginning of the creation. Without any distinction of creation into animate or inanimate.

Once in Rev. viz. chap. iii. 14.

Christ is called the beginning of the creation of God, the chief, prince, first cause, and supporter of all nature. The word *αρχη* here translated beginning, is translated elsewhere, as Eph. vi. 12, where it occurs in the plural, *principalities*.

The word *κτισις* creation occurs also in connection with the word *new*, in 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. Except in these two places, and in 1 Peter ii. 13, I maintain that the world at large, material and immaterial, visible and invisible, is denoted.

I ask, then, how the occurrence of the word in Galatians and Corinthians with a limiting adjunct, marking out a certain por-

ut Gentilium errorem, ipsi tamen se hoc facere minime animadvertant? quin illud quoque nosse operæ pretium est, eadem vocabula non semper easdem res significare, neque homonymiam synonymiam omni modo designari. De Filio enim generatio proprie dicitur, de conditis autem rebus, improprie: de illo inquam ob veritatem eandemque substantiam; de his autem, honoris et adoptionis causa. Volens enim genuit nos verbo veritatis. Quocirca homonymia hoc loco honoris æqualitatem ne pariat; nec quæ improprie dictæ sunt, proprie dicta esse quisquam existimet. Quandoquidem nec furorem, nec iram, nec alia omnia, quæ, cum divinæ naturæ minime conveniat, per abusum dicta sunt, quisquam mentis compos proprie usurpatæ esse dixerit. Perspicuum enim est, quod unicuique loco, et cuilibet dictioni, congrua et consentanea interpretatio adhibita, veritatem parturit.”

tion of creation that is *made new*, can alter its primitive and invariable import, so as to make it capable of conveying that restricted sense, though the limiting and defining adjunct be wanting? If it be capable of this sense, I may then say, that *the* creation is in Christ Jesus—that the creation is foreknown, predestinated, called, justified, glorified, without prefixing the word *new*. This recondite sense of the word would have been unknown to the Romans, without the key furnished by Galatians and Corinthians, which they had not; and we must therefore interpret it, as they would have interpreted it, according to the known use of words. Suppose, however, that we admit this new canon of criticism, and that a *substantive* may be taken to mean what an *adjective* at times joined with it, constrains it under such circumstances to signify, then may we put another construction on the place not as yet imagined. The word *κτισι* with the adjunct *αυθεντικη* in 1 Pet. iii. 13, signifies the supreme magistracy. We therefore may maintain that it is the supreme magistracy, which, with eager expectation, awaiteth the manifestation of the sons of God. This is not the way wherein we would deal with any other writing. A traveller relates in the course of his journal, that he passed through a Rhododendron forest. He afterwards takes notice of a number of other forests through which he has passed, or which he has seen in the distance, without specifying the kind of trees of which these forests are composed. Is there any man, possessing a due regard for truth, who would venture to assert, on the authority of this traveller's journal, that all the forests, through which he had passed, were forests of Rhododendrons? In the history of America, we read at an early stage, of the circumstances attending the discovery of what is there called the New World; its productions, inhabitants, &c., are described in glowing terms. Whenever we meet in subsequent pages with the word *world*, without the adjunct *new* prefixed, should we be justified in supposing it was understood?

Some one in Grotius suggested the idea of supplying the word *new* before *creation*, in Rom. viii. 19, 22, as did also Vortius. The very replies, which I offered to this notion, are, I find, given in Poole's Syn. Crit. Vortius, it appears, endeavoured to bolster up his view by pleading, that the *nova creatura* was spoken of, *ex more Hebræorum*, qui simplicia sæpe pro compositis usurpant; to which it is answered, sed ū simpliciter et sine additamento *κτισις* non vocantur. Neque satis cohæret sermo, si ūdem sint *κτισις* et filii Dei. Gill, who understands the Gentile world as opposed to the Jewish, by the word *creature*, replies to the notion of its signifying those who are *new creatures*, "these cannot be said to be in a state of bondage to

corruption, for they are freed from the dominion of sin, and are become servants of righteousness." But further, let us take the literal rendering of the Greek, which is thus correctly given by Macknight, (who states in a note, that "some commentators consider verse 20, as a parenthesis, and join verse 19 and 20 together, thus: 21. "the earnest desire of the creature looketh for the revelation of the sons of God, 21, In hope, &c.")

21. "In hope that the creature itself shall be liberated from the *bondage of corruption* into the *freedom of the glory* of the children of God."

You will at once perceive that as bondage and freedom are opposed to each other; so also are corruption and glory. The former φθζρα signifies *mortality, decay*, which now tyrannizes as a *slave-owner* over creation,* which is looking forward for a change of masters, hoping (ἀπικραδονία) with an anxious stretching forth of the head, to be placed under the liberating rule of the *glory*, which belongeth to the children of God. When their (ἀποκαλυψίς) apocalypse shall take place, the event for which the κτισίς is thus looking, freedom shall be proclaimed to the bounden—there shall be an entire exemption from that bondage, under which all nature now groaneth. Thus, by a most beautiful figure of speech, all nature is represented as one compound personage intensely looking out for the arrival of a glad and glorious era. For the outstretched head of creation looketh for (ἀπεκδέχεται see Phil. iii. 20.) the manifestation of the sons of God. The transitory sufferings of the present time can never be put in competition with the glory which shall be *apocalypsed* IN us; for even the creation itself, which shall not possess the glory, shall nevertheless derive from them such real solid benefit, such true freedom from real ills, that she also is desirous of our APOCALYPSE. The figure, by which the affections of the mind are attributed to inanimate nature, need not startle us. It is common in the Bible. *The trees of the wood* are required to *rejoice*, in common with the *joyful field*, before *Jehovah* when *he cometh*, &c. Psalm cxvi. 12, 13; Is. 42: 10–12. The same idea, with some variation, is expressed in Psalm xcvi. 8. "Let the floods clap their hands, let the hills be joyful together before the Jehovah," &c. Psalm cxlviii., consists solely of an invitation to all creation, animate and inanimate, material and immaterial, angels and men, the starry heavens and the depths of ocean, fire, hail, snow, vapours, mountains, and all hills, beasts and all cattle, creeping things, and birds of every wing, to praise the then only exalted name of

* The *heathen* according to Macknight, who inconsistently restricts the blessing here universally predicated of the κτισίς to those who believe amongst the heathen!

him, whose glory is above the earth and heaven; and who shall at that time exalt the horn of his *people, the praise of all his saints, even of the children of Israel, a people near unto him. Praise ye the Lord.* Why this is the very counterpart of Paul's statement which we have been considering, and marks the period of Israel's recovery and blessedness, as synchronizing with the epoch of the manifestation of the sons of God. The fact then is, that the place before us simply expresses the desire of all nature for that blissful change in the constitution of the world, which is predicted in the Psalms above referred to, as also in Isaiah xi. 6, 9.; lxxv. 25; Ezek. xxxiv. 25; Hos. ii. 18. The best commentary I know on the place is the following splendid passage of one, who was himself a master of figure, our own sweet poet, Cowper:—

The groans of nature in this lower world
Which heaven has heard for ages, have an end,
Foretold by prophets and by poets sung,
Whose fire was kindled at the prophet's lamp,
The time of rest, the promised sabbath comes.
Six thousand years of sorrow have well nigh
Fulfilled their tardy and disastrous course
Over a sinful world; and what remains
Of this tempestuous state of human things,
Is merely as the working of a sea
Before a calm, that rocks itself to rest;
For he whose ear the winds are, and the clouds
The dust, that waits upon his sultry march,
When sin hath moved him, and his wrath is hot,
Shall visit earth in mercy; shall descend
Propitious in his chariot paved with love;
And what his storms have blasted and defaced,
For man's revolt, shall with a smile repair.

* * * * *

O scenes surpassing fable, and yet true;
Scenes of accomplished bliss! which who can see,
Though but in distant prospect, and not feel
His soul refreshed with foretaste of the joy?
Rivers of gladness water all the earth,
And clothe all climes with beauty; the reproach
Of barrenness is past. The fruitful field
Laughs with abundance; and the land once lean,
Or fertile only in its own disgrace,
Exults to see its thistly curse repealed.
The various seasons woven into one,
And that one season an eternal spring.
The garden fears no blight, and needs no fence,
For there is none to covet, all are full.
The lion, and the libbard, and the bear,
Graze with the fearless flocks; all bask at noon
Together, or all gambol in the shade
Of the same grove, and drink one common stream.
Antipathies are none. No foe to man
Lurks in the serpent now; the mother sees,
And smiles to see, her infant's playful hand
Stretched forth to dally with the crested worm,

To stroke his azure neck, or to receive
 The lambent homage of his arrowy tongue.
 All creatures worship man, and all mankind
 One Lord, one Father. Error has no place;
 That creeping pestilence is driven away;
 The breath of heaven has chased it. In the breast
 No passion touches a discordant string,
 But all is harmony and love. Disease
 Is not; the pure and uncontaminate blood
 Holds its due course, nor fears the frost of age.
 One song employs all nations; and all cry,
 "Worthy the lamb, for he was slain for us!"

The remainder of the passage is too long to be transcribed. I conclude then, that universal nature is looking out for a most joyous event. To avoid pain, secure its cessation, and ensure happiness, is the object of all animal existence. The nobler vegetables, when the care of the cultivator is absent, struggle to maintain their superiority over the thistle and the briar. While earth groaning audibly, (under the anguish of the curse) in the earthquake and the volcano, has already attempted to vomit forth the fire that preyeth on her vitals. Yea, she has wrought hard to antedate the time, when nations shall be born in a day, and there shall be no more sea, by the heaving forth of island after island from the depths of the abyss. The manifestation of the sons of God is the event, for the occurrence of which, all nature is so big with anticipation. She longeth for this event, because her liberation is dependant on the glory, which shall be revealed in the children of God, when they obtain the adoption. But not only is creation at large groaning and travailing in labour pains for the arrival of this period, but "we ourselves also which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body." We do so with still greater propriety, with a deeper sense of personal interest; for that event, the ADOPTION, or, as before expressed, the APOCALYPSE OF THE SONS OF GOD shall prove the *redemption* of our bodies, bodies that now harass us, and are subject to such disease and suffering, bodies which we cheerfully mortify, bodies in which we hail reproach, and endure suffering *for* and *with* Christ; knowing that when he shall appear, with whom we jointly suffer, we shall be like him and be jointly glorified with him. If nature then, involuntarily subjected to vanity, shall then be emancipated, what and how great will be *our glory*, when the very manifestation *in us* shall bring such benefit to the world at large? So exceeding great will be the weight thereof as to mock all comparison with our present light afflictions, which are but for a moment.

Such for many years has been the view I have taken of the Apostle's reasoning. I was willing, for the sake of the argu-

ment, to take lower ground in the recent discussion, which took place, and, to show that even were the expression, *the creation* and *the whole creation*, understood to denote mankind merely, without embracing, (as I have no doubt whatever they do,) the lower animals and the ground still subject to the curse for man's sake, the argument would still be weighty enough to overturn all the schemes of our spiritualizers; and the passage direct us to an era, when the condition of mankind, then subject to the rule of Christ and his joint heirs, shall be unspeakably improved. I feel that I left the argument, on that occasion, imperfect; and therefore deem it necessary to add these remarks for the cause of truth—truth, in my apprehension, the most cheering, spiritual, and edifying—the very truth for the realization of which we are taught in the divine word, *to hope*. I would refer you in addition to Fry's commentary on the passage, which contains many weighty observations. I could write much more, and quote largely from ponderous folios, since there is such an overweening regard for authority. One observation and I have done. All the difficulties with which this passage has been surrounded, have arisen from the indisposition to admit the doctrine of the renovation of nature at the apocalypse of the sons of God, which it obviously teaches, when suffered to speak for itself; and is not tortured from its plain and grammatical import, except by those who would be wise above that which is written. I annex a quotation from Doddridge, which shews the readiness with which men resolve on departing from the letter of Scripture, when they find it opposed to their own system.

I have the honour to remain, &c.

EXTRACT FROM DODDRIDGE ABOVE REFERRED TO.

Verse 19. "*The earnest expect, &c.* This, and the following verses, have been generally, and not without reason, accounted as difficult as any part of this epistle. The difficulty has perhaps been something increased by rendering *κτίσις* *creation* in one clause, and *creature* in another. To explain it, as chiefly referring to the brutal or inanimate creation is *insufferable*; since the day of the redemption of our bodies will be attended with the conflagration, which will put an end to them!!!" This was his own unfounded assumption which he does not pause to prove, and which no man can prove. According to his theory, however, this was to be the case, and, because this passage opposes his theory, its plain import is to be rejected.

He proceeds, "The interpretation, therefore, by which *Dr. Whitby* and *Mr. Grove* refer it to the *Gentile* world is much preferable to this." Why? Apply his own argument to this interpretation, and how much better will it be? Is the *Gentile* world to survive and be improved after the conflagration, which, according to his opinion, has put an end to the whole? He was not, however, satisfied with this stretch of *Whitby's* expository skill, and therefore he adds as follows, endeavouring to apply to the present condition of things what is said of the future—"But, on the whole, I think, it gives a much sublimer and nobler sense to suppose it a bold *prosopopæia*, by which, on account of the calamity sin brought, and continued on the whole *unevangelized* world,* (though few of its inhabitants saw so much of their misery, as actually to desire the remedy,) it is represented as *looking out with eager expectation* (as the word *προσμερομένη* exactly signifies) for such a remedy and relief as the *Gospel* brings, by the prevalency of which human nature would be rescued from vanity and corruption, and inferior creatures from tyranny and abuse. Nothing is more common than to represent *a land* as *mourning* or *rejoicing*, as *calling for rain* &c."

* For the introduction of the adjunct *unevangelized* he has still less authority than our friends who supplied us so gratuitously with the adjunct *new*.

NOTE TO PAGE 33.

This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled, Luke 21: 32; Mark 13: 30; Matth. 24: 34. Non præteribit *generatio* hæc—non transibit *generatio* hæc *Vulgate*. Jerome on Matth. 24, 34, gives the following gloss on the word *generatio*. Omne genus hominum significat, aut specialiter Judæorum. The *Glossa Ordinaria* as it is called, is as follows: omne genus hominum, vel gens Judæorum quæ non deficiet donec veniat dies Domini. De Lyra, understands by *generatio*, congregatio fidelium, that is, the church shall not pass away—it shall be preserved until all be fulfilled.

Jerome, although not the author of the Latin version, called the *Vulgate*, must be considered a competent expositor of the meaning of the Latin word *generatio*, so far at least as to prove that the word was deemed in his day to admit of either sense he gives it.

Piscator translates the word (γενεα) *genea* in the verses under consideration, *ætas*, Beza translates the word (γενεα) sometimes *gens* and sometimes *natio*. Montanus, Fabricius, and Tremellius translate it *generatio* in these places. Erasmus translates it *ætas* in Matth. and Luke, and *generatio* in Mark. The word *gens* has a broader import than *natio*. For example we may say *gens Germanorum* and *natio Saxonum*, but the word *generatio* is less restricted in its use than either. We may say for example *generatio avium* as well as *generatio hominum*. Cicero uses the word in the sense of *ortus*, *procreatio*, and the word γενεα may be used in the same broad sense. Its synonyms are γενος γενεσος ποσος ηλικια, and it may be translated, if the context require it, by the words progenies, ætas, nobilitas, natura, ortus, familia, liberi, as well as receive the sense of (universum tempus humanæ vitæ, or spatium triginta annorum)—a life time. Plato has the phrase τις γενεαν quo genere ortus.

The word (εθνος) *ethnos*, also frequently occurs in the N. T. See Matth. 21: 43; Luke 7: 5; John 11: 48, 50, 52—18: 35. It may be useful to refer to these places in order to observe the different use of the words εθνος and γενεα. “The kingdom of God shall be taken from you (i. e. from your nation) and given to a (εθνε) nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” For he (the centurion) loveth our (εθνος) nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.” “If we let him thus alone, &c. the Romans will come and take away both our place and (εθνος) nation.” “Nor consider that it is expedient, that one man should die, &c. and that the whole (εθνος) nation perish not. This he spake not of himself, but, &c., he prophesied that Jesus should die for

that (ἐθνός) nation, and not for that (ἐθνός) nation only, but that he should also gather together," &c. "Pilate answered thine own (ἐθνός) nation hath delivered thee to me," &c.

In all these places the word ἐθνός is restricted to the Jewish race (γένεα) then living. The word (γένεα) race in the extended sense above suggested would have been inapposite. The word (ἐθνός) can properly be applied only to a body of men existing together in a community. The word (γένεα) race, will admit of that use, and also of being applied to a race of men descended from the same stock in a dispersed condition, as the Jews have now been for nearly eighteen centuries. The Jews have long ceased to be an ἐθνός, but they are still a γένεα. They are indeed the people of whom it was prophesied, "Lo! the people shall dwell alone (καὶ ἐν ἐθνεσιν οὐ συλλογισθήσεται, lxx.) and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Numb. 23: 9. Still as their dispersion is temporary, and comparatively speaking brief, and as the purpose of God to restore and build them is immutable, they are spoken of in prophecy as a nation, and as a people that shall not cease from being a nation, Jeremiah 31: 35.

Assuming then for a moment that our Lord (in Luke 21: 32 for example) intended to declare that the Jewish race, should be preserved through the awful and long continued desolations which should come upon them during the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentile powers, and during their captivity and dispersion among all nations, even until the period allotted to the existence of the nations should elapse, and until the day of the appearance of the Son of Man in a cloud with power and great glory—assuming this, how apposite was the choice of the word γένεα? Obviously the word ἐθνός would not serve that purpose, for Jerusalem was to be utterly destroyed within a few years from that time, and the Romans, as the High Priest feared, were to come and take away their (ἐθνός) nation, and their existence as a community or body politic was to cease. But their (γένεα) race was to remain distinct and distinguishable during a long tract of time, as the event has proved, and that too under circumstances which demonstrate the unceasing watchfulness of God over them *as a race of men*.

But even if the meaning of the word were doubtful—the text in which it stands, alone being considered—events have made the meaning clear. The Lord Jesus Christ foresaw the event, and when speaking of what he foresaw, he must be supposed to have used the word in a sense commensurate with his sense of the subject of which he spoke. When he said, Jerusalem shall be trodden down of nations, till their times

(i. e. the appointed times of their continuance or existence as communities, Acts 17: 26; Dan. 2nd Chapt.) should elapse, he foresaw all that has since occurred, and spoke of all that has occurred or shall occur until the time of the end, and the event has given a fulness of meaning to the expression which the Christians of the early ages of the church did not perceive. If the infidel should reply, it is begging the question to say that the Lord Jesus Christ foresaw all that has occurred, and therefore meant it, let him explain how it has happened that in accordance with the declaration so understood, the Jewish race without any great physical peculiarities, has been preserved distinct, during so long a period—why their desolated city retains its name, in spite of imperial authority to change it—why the hearts of the Jews, uninfluenced by the love of home, and the scenes of their early recollection, and all those strictly natural feelings, which bind far the greater portion of mankind to the neighbourhood of their nativity (and which in the case of those Jews who were dispersed by the swords of the Romans, were extinguished only with their lives,) should long for and expect under the most forbidding appearances, their own actual return to their Zion—to their Jerusalem. Patriotism it cannot be; nor can it be accounted for upon any natural principles; but he who uttered the prophecy, and who will order all things so that they shall conspire to its fulfilment at the appointed hour, has watched over and preserved the race, and with it a feeling a-kin to that instinct or passion, which we call patriotism, in those who have a country and have been separated from it, but which in no other case has been transmitted, or can, by any natural causes, be transmitted in a dispersed people, from father to son during a succession of more than fifty generations. This preservation appeared to Celsus—an infidel writer who flourished probably in the reign of Hadrian—so improbable that he ventured to predict the extinction of the Jews as a race, not long after his own time. This writer had witnessed their second rebellion and its consequences to them as a nation.—But the event has falsified the presage of this infidel, and justified the words of our Lord, and of the Old Testament prophets. (See Is. 43: 1-6.) Although the Jewish people have been the object of contempt and hatred to other nations during so long a time, they still subsist. In fact they have survived all sorts of oppressions and calamities, which must have annihilated them, or swallowed them up as a deluge, or consumed them as a conflagration, and effaced every thing appertaining to them from the earth, had not an invisible and an omnipotent hand sustained

and preserved them contrary to the ordinary course of human things.

Let the people of Israel be dispersed and beaten by the most violent tempests, they shall not perish.—Let them be borne on the whirlwind of the wrath of God, like the vile dust of the earth, to the extremities of the world, they shall always subsist before God as a peculiar people, and shall not be mingled with the nations. Jeremiah explains and confirms this truth by a comparison taken from the invariable laws of Nature. “Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day—the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea, when the waves thereof roar,—The Lord of Hosts is his name—if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever,” &c. See Jeremiah 31: 35 to the end.

Other nations may become confounded together and be dissolved one in another—they may lose their name, their political state, and all traces of their origin, as in fact has happened to all the ancient nations,—the Egyptians, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Gauls, Anglo-Saxons and others. Perhaps few, very few of the families which formerly composed those nations, have continued to propagate themselves unmixed to our times,—certainly there is not one family, nor even an individual among us, who can ascend, by a well authenticated pedigree, back to the times of those national bodies, politic, of which his ancestors were members—that is to say, through a descent of eighteen or twenty centuries.

The Jews on the contrary, though they have been so long dispersed among the nations, subsist without commingling with them. They can ascend by an incontestable pedigree to the parent stock. The registers of their tribes may have perished, but the Israelites, scattered through all places of the earth, know well that they have all descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and none can with reason dispute their claim. “Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith the Lord, for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee; but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished.” Jer. 46: 28.

But to return to the passage in question: The expression, “This generation shall not pass away,” &c. is a prophecy. As if our Lord had said—The enemies of the Jews shall encompass this city and destroy it, and tread it down, during the whole period of their existence as nations, although the

Jews themselves shall fall by the edge of the sword and be carried away captives, not into one nation only, as formerly they were to Babylon, but into all nations,—although evils and calamities shall come upon them which would exterminate any other nation, and which, according to the common course of human things, would exterminate the race of the Jews, yet shall they be preserved through them all,—this race shall not pass away—until the Son of Man shall come again in a cloud with power and great glory.

One observation more: If these views are correct, the papal idea of embracing all nations and kindreds (and the Jews among the rest) in their communion, is founded on a mistaken view of God's purposes in relation to the Jews.—God's mercy has been shown to the Jews and Gentiles by turns, Rom. 11: 30, 31.—It was continued to the Jews from Abraham, till they rejected and crucified the Lord of glory, and wrath then came upon them, which will continue (*ὡς τελευτῶν* 1 Thess. 2: 16,) until the end of this dispensation. Paul's hope in preaching the gospel to his kindred, was, that he might *gain some of them*, Rom. 11: 14. He did not expect their universal conversion and amalgamation with the Gentiles in the Christian Church, Rom. 11: 25. The papal church cannot expect to survive the times of the Gentiles, and yet the blindness of the Jews *as a nation*, will continue during the times of the Gentiles, and as long as Jerusalem shall be trodden down by them. The persecutions, therefore, which that people have suffered from the Roman church on account of their religion, were the offspring of false theology, as well as of pride and cruelty, and that church has been a co-worker with pagan Rome, with the Saracens and the Turks, in executing those judgments which the Lord predicted should come upon them and continue until he should come a second time for their deliverance.

The Church of Rome has always regarded the Jews as heretics, and canons of different councils forbade Christians to eat with them, or have any dealings with them on pain of excommunication.* The Inquisition expelled 800,000 Jews from Spain during the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and those persecuted people despairing of finding an asylum in Catholic Europe, took refuge in the Ottoman Empire. Emanuel, King of Portugal, required that Jewish children under 14 years of age, should be separated from their parents and forced to adopt the Roman Catholic Religion. Our Lord, when he uttered the prophesy in question, foresaw all these

* The civil law, which in very many places bears the marks of Papal influence, does not allow Jews to be produced as witnesses against the orthodox. *Judæi et heretici contra orthodoxos produci in judicio testes nequeunt.*

things, yet he declared that the race should be preserved until this vast fabric of political and ecclesiastical tyranny should be destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

NOTE TO PAGE 39.

When the prophets speak of the *earth*, and sometimes when they speak of the *world*, we must understand them to intend merely the territories of the four monarchies,—or the empire symbolized by the *statue* described in the 2nd chap. of the prophet Daniel. This has been called the prophetic earth, or world, which is nothing more than such parts of the world as were known by the ancients. It is important to observe that the empires of the monarchies represented in the *statue*, are in an important sense but one empire, which was commenced by the king of Babylon, who was represented by the head of the *statue*,—continued by the Persian and Medes, represented by the arms and the breast of the *same statue*, and by the Grecian kings, who were represented by the belly and the thighs, and completed by the Latin kings, who were represented by the legs and the feet of the image. These different kings and kingdoms being represented by the component parts of a human body of gigantic size, may be considered together as *one form*, or as *forming one whole* kingdom; because these several parts are correlative, and the existence of one part implies the coexistence and connexion of the other parts. Were we to see the head for example to rise into view, we should expect the other parts to be in their proper place, though concealed at the moment from our observation.

From this mode of considering these four kingdoms (*viz.* the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian and the Roman)—as component parts of one larger kingdom, it results that both in the Old and in the New Testaments, Rome (which is represented by the legs and feet of the image) is called Babylon, (which is the head of it:) Because, in the mind of the Holy Spirit, which embraces, under one glance, the whole series of the times of the kingdoms represented in the image, the empire of Babylon was but the beginning of the Roman empire, as the head was but the upper part of the image, while the Roman empire in its turn was nothing else but Babylon in its development, as the legs and feet were but the completion of the image. See Rev. chaps. 17 and 18.

This very simple view of the subject supplies a reason for giving to Rome the name of Babylon* mystically.

* Babylon is mentioned twelve times in the N. T. viz: four times by Matth.
VOL. III.—39

Some persons have thought that the special territory of each of the four monarchies, is that which it possessed at the moment when Jerusalem or the people of God became subject to them respectively,—in other words, that these kingdoms successively entered into and became a part of the image, at the time when the Jewish people became subject to them respectively. So that in order to determine the geographical extent of each kingdom as viewed in prophecy, we must ascertain its territorial limits at and before the submission or subjugation of the Jews to it.

In order to determine the extent of the kingdom of Babylon, according to this principle, we must exclude from its ultimate extent, Armenia, Asia Minor, Persia, Tyre, Egypt, Africa and Spain, (a part of which Nebuchadnezzar is said to have conquered) because all these conquests were preceded by the taking of Jerusalem.

So in determining the extent of the Medo-Persian kingdom, we must exclude from its greatest extent, Egypt and Asia Minor.

On this principle, the Grecian kingdom will be composed of all Greece, all Asia Minor, all Syria, and the whole of Egypt;

1: 11, 12, 17—once by Stephen the proto-martyr, Acts 7: 43, in which places we are to understand the word literally—once by Peter in his salutations, 1 Epist. 5: 13, where perhaps we should understand the word literally, although the Romanists say that Rome here is meant—and six times by John in Rev. 14: 8—16: 19—17: 5—18: 2, 10, 21. Isaiah (in chaps. 13th and 14th) contains a prophecy of the destruction of Babylon, which was uttered about 130 years before the Jews were carried into captivity, and about 200 years before the destruction of Babylon by Cyrus. Isaiah does not foretell the captivity of the Jews, but their deliverance only. Was not this omission designed to give the prophecy a double aspect? Is it not in one of its aspects a prophecy of things yet to come on the mystical Babylon?—Observe the abruptness with which John introduces the name of Babylon into the Revelation. The *first thing* he says of it is, "Babylon is fallen—is fallen," Επεσεν ετερε βαβυλων η πολις η μεγαλη.—John informs us, that he saw six angels appearing in succession. The first had the everlasting gospel to preach to all the dwellers of the earth—His message was, "fear God and give glory to Him; for the hour (season, period *ερα*) of his judgment is come." The second angel followed, saying "Babylon, the city, the great one, is fallen, is fallen." He had told us nothing of Babylon before, nor what evil it had done, but assuming its existence, he announces its fall, and then assigns the reason, "because she had made *all nations* (not the Jews) drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication," Rev. 14: 8. The next time he mentions it, is immediately after the seventh vial was poured in the air. This was followed by great commotions, "the great city was divided into three parts—the cities of the nations fell, and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath." How intense this expression! The next time he mentions Babylon, he gives us her character. It is *mystery* Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. In chap. 18 he mentions Babylon as fallen, (ver. 2) as the great city—that mighty city suddenly brought to judgment, (ver. 10) and thrown down as a great millstone is cast into the sea, (ver. 21.) This symbolical act, marks her utter and hopeless ruin.

as Alexander had conquered all these countries, before he became master of Jerusalem.

Coming now to the fourth, or the Roman kingdom, this principle requires us to exclude from it England, Holland and lower Germany, because neither of these countries was subdued by the Romans, until after they had conquered the Jews. In the year B. C. 65, Pompey destroyed the kingdom of Syria. In 63 B. C. the same Roman general took Jerusalem by assault: In the year B. C. 30, Augustus Cæsar destroyed the Greek kingdom of the Ptolemies in Egypt, and fully established his authority in Jerusalem. At the accession of Augustus Cæsar, the limits of the Roman Empire were said to be, the river Danube on the North—the Rhine on the East—the Atlantic ocean on the West, and Mount Atlas in Africa on the South. Those who adopt this principle, look for the ten kingdoms within the geographical limits thus determined, and of course they exclude Britain, Holland, Prussia and Russia.

In confirmation of this principle, it is said that the geography or particular territory of each of the four monarchies, may be determined by the language peculiar to each. Thus the Chaldean language continued to be spoken between the Euphrates and Tigris, and towards the mouth of the Euphrates—the Persian to the East of the Tigris—the Greek throughout Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia as far as the Danube, and the Mountains of Illyricum: and finally the Latin language prevailed in Africa as far as to Mount Atlas, in Europe on the west bank of the Rhine, and the whole right bank of the Danube to the Mediterranean sea, and to the ocean. The French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese languages, are little more than so many different corruptions of the Latin, and the religious worship of all these countries is performed in Latin by the Roman Catholics. They pray, and sing, and say mass in Latin, and the Pope employs the Latin language in his letters and public decrees.

NOTE TO PAGES 45 TO 47.

Peter (in 2 Epist. 3: 6) speaks of the earth as it existed before the flood, *as the world which then was*, (ὁ τότε κόσμος.) In ver. 7 he speaks of the earth as it has existed since the flood, *as the heavens and the earth which are now*, (οἱ δε νυν ουρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ.) In ver. 13th he declares his expectation of new heavens and a new earth, (καινοὺς ουρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν.) Thus in three verses (6, 7, 13,) this apostle speaks of *three worlds*, the first two of which were only different organizations or modifications of this same planet.

The Apostle Paul in Heb. 2: 5, speaks of *the world to come*, which is not to be put in subjection unto angels as the present world is, Heb. 1: 14. The word (*οικουμένην*) which is here translated *world*, is never used in the N. T. or elsewhere to signify *heaven*. (See Luke 4: 5—2: 1—21: 26. Matth. 24: 14. Acts 11: 28—17: 6, 31—19: 27—24: 5. Rom. 10: 18. Heb. 1: 6—2: 5. Rev. 3: 10—12: 9—16: 14, which are all the places in which it occurs.) The word in fact is a participle of the feminine gender, and the word *γῆν* is to be supplied, (quasi *τὴν γῆν οἰκουμένην*.) Examples of the use of this word are the following: The devil shewed him all the *kingdoms of the world*. Cæsar decreed that *all the world should be taxed*, &c. See the places referred to. Paul then refers to an *habitable earth** to come, or some future condition of this planet which shall differ in the same sense, though it may be in a far greater degree, from the world that now is—or the habitable earth in its present condition, as the world that now is, differs from the world that was before the flood.

We have then, *three worlds* (*κοσμοὶ* if a plural is allowable in such a connexion) spoken of in scripture as existing on this planet: *viz.* The world before the flood—the world which now is—the habitable earth to come, according to Paul's expression, or the new heavens and the new earth, according to Peter's. It may be observed too, that the word (*κοσμος* translated) world is derived from *κοσμεω*, to adorn, organize or reduce to order, garnish. (See Matth. 25: 7—12: 44. 1 Tim. 2: 9. 1 Pet. 3: 3, *κοσμος* bene compositus, honestus, gravis.) This word (*κοσμος*) *world*, therefore, is adapted to express the idea of a certain physical or organized condition of the planet, which in some sort is *accidental*, rather than essential; and which may pass away or be changed, while the planet as a body remains.—This may explain the expression of Paul in 1 Cor. 7: 31, *παράγει το σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου* the fashion of the world—that is its entire condition as an organized body considered as existing in a certain form or physical condition—passeth away. The expression *το σχῆμα τῆς σκηνῆς παράγει* means that *the scene* changes and presents a new appearance; and Grotius says the expression of the apostle is borrowed from the theatre. This expression is an example of the present tense used for the future. The apostle means that the scheme or physical condition of the world is destined to an entire change. Yet accord-

* Owen observes upon this expression, that it denotes "a certain state and condition of things in this world; for the apostle does not treat directly concerning heaven," and to call heaven, the world to come because we are to go into it, is (said Beza) "rather harsh."

ing to this same apostle, it is to be followed by a new habitable earth, another world, Heb. 2: 5.

Again, the scriptures teach that each of these three great periods (or worlds) is to be consummated by a great judgment, involving the ruin of the wicked. The first, or antediluvian world was consummated, as we know, by a universal deluge, which destroyed the race, except eight persons. The world to come, or the future habitable earth, will be consummated by the general resurrection, and the last judgment before the great white throne, and the final separation of the righteous and the wicked, (Rev. 20: 11-15.) And the world which now is, also will be terminated by a fearful judgment, though not such as will destroy the entire race. See Haggai 2: 21, 22. Other prophecies which relate to this intermediary judgment are, Jer. chap. 30. Joel chap. 2. Zeph. chap. 1. 2 Pet. 3 chap. 2 Thess. 1: 1-7. Is. 30: 27, 30—66: 12, 16—13: 5-13—24: 1-6, 16, 22—34: 1-8. The calamities described in such scriptures as these, (*the slain of the Lord shall be many—there shall be few men left, &c. &c.*) do not comport with the idea of the final judgment, when all the dead *shall be raised to life*, and after being judged, shall be sent away to everlasting punishment. Hence it is, that we expect these scriptures will be fulfilled, at the close of this dispensation, and will precede, in the order of occurrence, the world to come, whereof Paul speaks in Heb. 2: 5.

These observations prepare the way for considering the answer of our Lord to Pilate, recorded in John 18: 36. My kingdom is not of this world, (*ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.*) Our Lord appeared in the flesh during the second of the worlds whereof we have spoken—in the world that now is, whose scheme or fashion is destined to pass away. When, therefore, he said to Pilate “my kingdom is not of this world,” he affirmed that he should establish no outward visible kingdom on the earth in its present condition. But can it be inferred from what he said, that he will not establish an outward and visible kingdom with power, on the earth hereafter, when, by his almighty energies, he shall have transformed it into another and very different physical condition—in fact into *another world*? Sin and Satan have marred this portion of the creation of God; and God has not only withdrawn his glory from it, but has let his curse fall and rest upon it and its inhabitants. “Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness,” 2 Pet. 3: 13. Then Satan shall be bound—the curse shall be removed—briars and thorns,—a part of the curse, shall no more grow—the favour of God shall return—the earth shall no more

withhold her increase (Ezek. 24: 27. Hosea 2: 21, 22), but its productions, like the widow's pittance of meal and oil, shall multiply without stint, and yield a supply adequate to the wants of all its dwellers.

Now, if we may suppose that Paul in Heb. 2: 5 had respect to a future condition of this earth, which shall be free from the curse,—if Peter also, had respect to the same condition, when he spoke of the *new earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness, would it not be in the proper sense of the word *another* world, a *new world*, though existing upon the same material sphere, preserving the same relative position in the vast fabric of the creation? And did not our Lord mean to declare merely, that his earthly, outward, visible kingdom would not co-exist with this accursed condition of the earth?—that his kingdom would commence in the utter expulsion of Satan and the curse from the world, and the restitution of all things to perhaps a greater beauty and glory than that which existed before the fall of man and the curse—in a *παλιγγενεσία* or generation of things anew? If such was the meaning of our Lord's reply to Pilate, Cæsar had nothing to fear from the earthly kingdom of Christ, so long as Satan should be permitted to retain his usurpation over the world. But in the millenary state, when all things shall be made anew, who can say that all dominions will not serve and obey the outward, visible dominion of the Lord Christ? The work of recreating, regenerating, restoring all things to their primeval beauty and glory will not be done, for the sake of the great enemy of God and man, but for the sake of him whose right they are.

The Roman Catholic Church, therefore, has anticipated the period of an oecumenical see, and of a central worship by the whole of this present dispensation. That church has also—while denying to the Church of Christ, or its head, any temporal or earthly power—in fact exercised for centuries a controlling influence in the affairs of this world. If the foregoing remarks are well founded, this too is an anticipation of an attribute, which really belongs to the Church of Christ, but which our Lord declared should not be put in exercise during the present condition of things. But when the angel, who has the key of the abyss shall descend, and lay hold of the dragon, that old serpent, the Devil and Satan, and bind him and cast him into the abyss, and set a seal upon him, that he shall deceive the nations no more," (Rom. 20: 1-3) *then* the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High, Dan. 7: 27. And they will exercise the power of the kingdom over earthly things openly and confessedly, and by direct and positive claim under their adorable Head.



